

# THE Anti-Slavery Reporter

PUBLISHED UNDER THE SANCTION OF THE  
BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

Series 4.  
Vol. XIX., No. 2.

MARCH-MAY, 1899.

{ *Gratis to  
Subscribers.*

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
ZANZIBAR MAINLAND SLAVERY ... ..	59
THE NEW VICE-PRESIDENT ... ..	61
THE SOCIETY'S SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY—ANNUAL MEETING ... ..	61
EXPORT OF SLAVES FROM TRIPOLI—LETTER FROM FOREIGN OFFICE ...	75
ZANZIBAR MAINLAND—LETTER TO LORD SALISBURY ... ..	76
PARLIAMENTARY—QUESTIONS ... ..	79
DEBATES ... ..	81
LETTER TO "THE TIMES"—MR. C. H. ALLEN ... ..	99
SOME PRESS COMMENTS ... ..	100
EGYPT AND THE SOUDAN—PARLIAMENTARY PAPER ... ..	103
BRITISH EAST AFRICA PROTECTORATE—PARLIAMENTARY PAPER ...	106
OBITUARY—MR. J. V. CRAWFORD—MR. W. MORGAN—DR. LEITNER ...	109
SLAVERY IN MOROCCO... ..	110
TESTIMONIAL TO MR. C. H. ALLEN ... ..	111
SLAVE TRAFFIC IN EAST AFRICA ... ..	111
WRECK OF A SLAVE DHOW ... ..	112
AFRICAN ASSOCIATION ... ..	112
PEMBA SLAVE GIRL ... ..	112

PUBLISHED AT THE OFFICES OF THE SOCIETY,  
55, NEW BROAD STREET, LONDON, E.C.

WATERLOW AND SONS LIMITED, PRINTERS, LONDON WALL, LONDON.

**1899.**

# The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

**PATRON:**

**H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES.**

**President:**

1884 **SIR THOMAS FOWELL BUXTON, Bart., G.C.M.G.**

**Vice-President:**

1886 **ALFRED E. PEASE, Esq., M.P.**

**Treasurer:**

1879 **JOSEPH ALLEN, Esq.**

**Honorary Secretary:**

1879 **CHARLES H. ALLEN, F.R.G.S.**

**Committee:**

1870 **ARTHUR ALBRIGHT, Esq.**  
1898 **W. A. ALBRIGHT, Esq.**  
1877 **J. G. ALEXANDER, Esq., LL.B.**  
1885 **W. WILBERFORCE BAYNES, Esq.**  
1887 **J. BEVAN BRAITHWAITE, Esq.**  
1894 **E. WRIGHT BROOKS, Esq.**  
1893 **CEPHAS BUTLER, Esq.**  
1889 **SYDNEY C. BUXTON, Esq., M.P.**  
1893 **JOEL CADBURY, Esq.**  
1893 **FREDERICK G. CASH, Esq.**  
1876 **JAMES CLARK, Esq.**  
1884 **R. N. CUST, Esq., LL.D.**  
1884 **R. W. FELKIN, Esq., M.D.**  
1885 **MAJOR-GENERAL SIR F. J. GOLDSMID, K.C.S.I.**  
1886 **HENRY GURNEY, Esq.**

1887 **DANIEL HACK, Esq.**  
1884 **CALEB R. KEMP, Esq.**  
1895 **CAPTAIN H. NEEDHAM KNOX, R.N.**  
1893 **JOHN H. LLOYD, Esq.**  
1895 **DONALD MACKENZIE, Esq.**  
1894 **W. CAREY MORGAN, Esq.**  
1893 **JOHN MORLAND, Esq.**  
1893 **JOSEPH A. PEASE, Esq., M.P.**  
1884 **ARNOLD PYE-SMITH, Esq.**  
1885 **FRANCIS RECKITT, Esq.**  
1898 **SIR JOHN SCOTT, K.C.M.G.**  
1894 **RICHARD N. SHORE, Esq.**  
1870 **REV. J. O. WHITEHOUSE.**  
1885 **W. H. WYLDE, Esq., C.M.G. (late of the Foreign Office *Slave-Trade Department*).**  
1895 **T. GRAHAM YOUNG, Esq.**

**Corresponding Members:**

**RIGHT REV. BISHOP TUCKER, Mombasa.**  
**G. T. ABRINES, Esq., Tangier, Morocco.**  
**FRANK ALLEN, Esq., Alexandria.**  
**B. R. BALFOUR, Esq., Drogheda.**  
**T. H. BARKER, Esq., Liverpool.**  
**THEODORE BURTT, Esq., Pemba.**  
**HON. AND REV. H. CLARK, Jamaica.**  
**PROFESSOR E. DESCAMPS, Louvain.**  
**WILLIAM HARVEY, Esq., Leeds.**  
**CAPTAIN E. C. HORE, South Seas.**  
**G. P. HUNOT, Esq., British Vice-Consul, Saffee.**  
**MONS. HIPPOLYTE LAROCHE, Paris, Ancien Résident Général de France, Madagascar.**  
**NOEL TEMPLE MOORE, Esq., C.M.G., late H.B.M. Consul-General, Tripoli.**  
**A. J. MORASSO, Esq., Tangier.**

**G. MOYNIER, Esq., Geneva.**  
**SENHOR JOAQUIM NABUCO, Brazil.**  
**PROF. EDOUARD NAVILLE, Geneva.**  
**REV. PÈRE OHRWALDER, Cairo.**  
**DR. PRUEN, Cheltenham.**  
**COMTE DE ST. GEORGE, Geneva.**  
**COLONEL SCHAEFER BEY, late Director of Egyptian Slavery Department.**  
**DR. G. SCHWEINFURTH, Cairo.**  
**REV. W. G. SHELLABEAR, Singapore.**  
**SLATIN PASHA, Cairo.**  
**M. LE COMTE D'URSEL, Brussels.**  
**M. COURTOIS DE VICQSE, Toulouse.**  
**W. J. WILSON, Esq., Cairo.**  
**COLONEL WINGATE, R.E., C.B. Cairo.**  
**A. B. WYLDE, Esq.**

**Secretary:**

1898 **TRAVERS BUXTON, M.A.**

**Bankers:** Messrs. BARCLAY & Co., 54, Lombard Street.

# The Anti-Slavery Reporter.

MARCH—MAY, 1899.

[*The Editor, whilst grateful to all correspondents who may be kind enough to furnish him with information, desires to state that he is not responsible for the views stated by them, nor for quotations which may be inserted from other journals. The object of the REPORTER is to spread information, and articles are necessarily quoted which may contain views or statements for which their authors can alone be held responsible.*]

---

## Zanzibar Mainland Slavery.

A LARGE proportion of our space in the present number is devoted to this subject, which has come somewhat prominently before the public of late, owing to its discussion in Parliament. We cannot complain that the facts to which we have given publicity regarding the administration of the Moslem custom of slavery by British officials in Mombasa have not been thoroughly made known in the House of Commons during this Session. As will be seen from the following pages, they formed the subject of a debate raised by Mr. THOMAS BAYLEY, M.P., on the Consolidated Fund Bill on March 22nd, and the matter has been raised several times in Committee of Supply and in the form of questions. It is clear that considerable interest has been aroused in the House on the subject, and that dissatisfaction with the *status quo* is not confined to one party or section. Unfortunately we have no indication that the Government intends to do anything in the matter. On the contrary, Mr. BRODRICK has stated: "Her Majesty's Government, having laid it down that British officials shall not take part in returning escaped slaves to their masters, see no reason for taking further action in this case" (the case of Kombo and the other two slaves ordered back to slavery in June last by Mr. Edward Lloyd, Acting District Officer in Mombasa)—that is to say, now that a definite case of violation of the Attorney-General's declaration in the House of Commons in June, 1897, and of Lord Salisbury's instructions to the Zanzibar authorities has been brought before them, the Government have resolved to close their eyes, and deliberately allow declaration and instructions alike to be quietly ignored in the British Protectorate.

Mr. BRODRICK says that there is a considerable conflict of statement in this case as between the officials and the missionary, the Rev. W. G. Howe, and suggests that many of the statements of the latter must be taken *cum grano salis*. (These were fully given in the September–December number of the *Reporter*, 1898, p. 203 foll., and were published in the form of a pamphlet which was extensively circulated by the Society among Members of Parliament in March last.)

The official account is that the slaves were anxious to return to their old master's house in order to get food, on account of the severe famine in Ribé, where they had been living at the Mission Station, and that the master desired to have his right to their services formally declared in return for the support he was willing to give. Mr. Howe is not in England (though we believe that he is on his way) and has not been able to reply to this official version, but we notice that the Rev. Wm. Yates of Leeds, who was formerly a missionary near Mombasa of the same Society (the United Methodist Free Church), wrote to the *Leeds Mercury* of March 24th, indignantly repudiating Mr. Brodrick's suggestion. He wrote :—

“I know that there is a considerable amount of famine in the Ribé district just now, but I also know that our missionaries are making great personal sacrifices in order to feed the hungry heathen who come begging daily at their doors ; and I repeat, therefore, that the disgraceful insinuation that these Christian converts were driven away from Ribé back into slavery by sheer hunger is a shameful imputation cast upon a body of Christian gentlemen, who, believing that even a heathen and a slave is both a man and a brother, are labouring yonder, and suffering on their lone mission stations for his civilisation and salvation.”

On the chief fact of the case, however, there is no dispute, viz., that the Arab master appeared in the Court of Mombasa before Her Majesty's Officer, and asked that his legal right to his escaped slaves should be declared and that they should be restored to him ; whereupon Mr. Lloyd gave it as his opinion that they had always been in slavery, *and ordered them back to their master.*

The Attorney-General now draws a subtle distinction, and declares that it is not illegal for a British subject to “express his opinion, even as a Judge, that a master is entitled to his slave” ; but what is the result of such an “opinion” expressed in such a way ? Most plain people would agree that it is a singularly effective method of “taking part” in restoring fugitive slaves to their masters, and so violating Lord Salisbury's instructions.

Mr. Brodrick's general reasons for not abolishing slavery on the mainland strip—that we cannot break our pledges to the Sultan of Zanzibar contained in the Edict of 1890, and the Agreement made in 1895 to maintain the law of Islam—we have heard and commented on before. Mr. Brodrick is conscious that our adherence to the so-called “pledge” in the Act of 1890, which lays down that the status of the slaves lawfully held shall be unchanged, would appear to be very considerably strained by the Abolition Decree of 1897 in the Islands, and he therefore adds : “The interference that has taken place in Zanzibar and Pemba has only been carried out by subsequent agreement with the Sultan himself.”

Surely in so saying he gives away his case, for no one can doubt that if the Government really wish to secure the disappearance of slavery in the

mainland, it would be an easy matter to "interfere" once more and make a further agreement with the Sultan himself to secure the desired result.

But this Society has often pointed out that the words of the Edict of 1890 refer only to all slaves "*lawfully* possessed on this date," and the first clause confirms all previous decrees against slavery, whether hitherto enforced or not. The Treaty of 1873 forbade the importation of slaves into the Islands, and by a recent decision no slaves brought into the coast district since the Decree of 1876 are lawfully possessed; the bulk of the slave population are therefore outside the terms of the Clause.

Then as to the undertaking made in 1895 to maintain the law of Islam—if this is to be taken to include the observance of the local customs of slavery, British officers must, if they are to abide by the undertaking, inevitably disobey the law of this country in its spirit, even if not in the very letter, and, in the language of the late Attorney-General, violate the best traditions of this country.

Are we content to be for ever bound by such an undertaking, which can only be kept at such a cost?

---

## NEW VICE-PRESIDENT.

WE have the pleasure to announce that MR. ALFRED E. PEASE, M.P., has accepted the Vice-Presidency of the Society in place of the new President. Mr. A. E. Pease has been a member of the Committee for thirteen years, and has done good work for the Anti-Slavery cause both in Parliament and outside. For some years he acted as spokesman for the Society in the House of Commons, this office having been more recently fulfilled by his brother, Mr. J. A. Pease, M.P.

---

## The Society's Sixtieth Anniversary.

### ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING.

IT having been resolved by the Committee that it was advisable to resume the former practice of regularly holding an Annual Meeting of subscribers and friends of the Society, the Meeting for this year, which marks the sixtieth anniversary of its foundation, was held on Friday, April 28th, in the theatre of the London Institution; the President, SIR T. FOWELL BUXTON, BART., occupying the chair. Several Members of Parliament accepted the invitation to take part in the proceedings, and admirable speeches were delivered.

Among those present, beside the speakers, were Mr. H. R. Fox Bourne (Secretary of the Aborigines' Protection Society), Mr. Wm. Tallack (Secretary of the Howard Association), Mr. F. W. Fox, Mr. Charles H. Allen (Honorary Secretary), Mr. Cephas Butler, Mr. Donald Mackenzie, Mr. J. A. Pease, M.P., Mr. Francis Reckitt, Mr. R. N. Shore, &c.

The SECRETARY (Mr. Travers Buxton) read the names of the following gentlemen who had written to express regret at inability to attend the meeting and sympathy with its objects :—Sir W. Brampton Gurdon, M.P. (who had promised to speak, but was prevented by an attack of pneumonia), Sir John Kennaway, M.P., Mr. Courtney, M.P., Mr. John Morley, M.P., Mr. Bryce, M.P., Sir Robert Reid, M.P., Rev. Canon Wilberforce, and Mr. Charles Trevelyan, M.P., also Mr. Sydney Buxton, M.P., and other members of the Committee.

The spirit of the meeting, thorough in its opposition to Slavery, and entirely free from partisan feeling or bias, will be an encouragement to the Society to carry on the fight with determined vigour.

It will be noticed that Mr. Thomas Bayley lays stress on the fact that the truth as to East African Slavery is not known in the constituencies, and that it is the duty of the Society to remove that ignorance by starting a crusade throughout the country. This is a suggestion which well deserves serious attention on the part of all friends of Anti-Slavery work, for such an agitation would obviously require much larger funds than the Society at present has at its disposal.

THE CHAIRMAN (Sir T. F. Buxton) opened the meeting by expressing regret at the decease of the late President of the Society, Mr. Arthur Pease, M.P. He said, if he had taken any part in the discussion, he should have suggested that Mr. Pease's successor ought to have had a seat in Parliament; possibly it ought to have been a man younger than he whom they had lost, and possibly one who had been at home during the last three or four years, and able to keep in close touch with the current history of the Slave Trade and the Slavery question, which was more possible to those at home than to those whose duties lay in the Antipodes. He, however, was willing to submit to the judgment of the committee, and desired only to do what was best for the Cause.

He then expressed regret at the resignation of Mr. Charles Allen, the former Secretary, whose services had been so beneficial to the Society. He felt sure that the new President and the new Secretary would have the best support of its old friends in whatever they might be called upon to do in its behalf.

In moving the adoption of the report, the President said it would be very easy, no doubt, for this country, and for the people individually to keep quite clear of everything connected with Slavery if they were to adopt the policy, say, of a country like Switzerland, which had no foreign connections or responsibilities; but if we found ourselves, as a country, impelled to advance, sometimes, it may be, by self-interest, but often by the sincerest desire to better those over whom our rule has extended, there will necessarily be intervals when we assume authority over territories like those of Africa, East or West, when we shall find practices in vogue that we are unable all at once to put an end to, but which we wish to put an end to by degrees. And we find that to be the case in our most recent acquisition of the Soudan, where Lord Kitchener, with all his authority, power, and influence, has found himself

unable to set aside Mahomedan law. He has to acknowledge that it is the law of the country, and many things in it have to be allowed, as it were, for the time. What we require is that the advance shall be as rapid as possible, that there shall be no undue delay; and we are perfectly justified, if we see the progress is not as fast as it ought to be, in pushing it forward, and using every influence to bring about the suppression of all objectionable customs, habits, and practices which claim our attention.

It is the work of the Society to do its utmost to suppress Slavery and the Slave Trade, and many vile practices connected with them. He sincerely hoped that they were going to see greater and more rapid advance than they had done in the past. One knows that when one goes into countries of this kind, one runs certain risks. He was quite sure that few men were more earnest in their desire to elevate the people of those territories with which they came in contact than Sir W. Mackinnon, who, in spite of the risks he ran, had undertaken to build a road into the interior, owing to what had been said about the employment of slaves, in order to bring down the ivory and other goods from the interior, and thus check the capture of slaves for this purpose; and he, and some of those associated with him, spent certainly something like £8,000 or £10,000 in building that road. But even the East Africa Company, whose object was purely and simply to raise the tone of the country which came under its control, had been compelled for a time to wink at practices which it was its duty to suppress and put an end to.

But if a long delay is necessary, if all the arguments used are justified, we might fairly ask, what was the use of putting forward the proclamation of the Queen in 1897? It had been his duty during the last three or four years sometimes to give expression to what he believed to be the personal wish of the Queen. It had been a great responsibility, but he had always felt the duty of being extremely careful of only saying that of which he was perfectly sure. It did not seem to him altogether respectful to the Queen to put into her mouth, as it were, a certain proclamation, and then to turn round and say it was of no account at all. He thought that if they maintained that the decrees of the past, the decrees of 1873 and 1876, had any weight in them, there could not be any legal claim upon the slaves. Referring to the question of compensation, and to the action of the East Africa Company in 1888, when, there being a risk of some disturbance arising, Mr. George Mackenzie arranged that a sum of money should be paid to the Arabs which might be described as compensation, the President maintained that in such exceptional circumstances as these, the giving of compensation was justifiable.

He expressed the belief that those who had done him the honour of wishing him to succeed Mr. Arthur Pease as President credited him with a desire to follow the traditions of his fathers. His grandfather was one of those who advocated the payment of the famous £20,000,000 which were given to the owners of slaves, and it must be remembered that that was one of the chief traditions connected with Slavery and the Slave Trade.

The President referred to the presence of several Members of Parliament, and suggested that it was the first duty of the Society to obtain information and supply it to those who were advocating the cause in the House of Commons and the House of Lords.

He concluded by saying that he should do his utmost to maintain the good work of the Society, and felt sure that they would have the support of those outside and those inside the House. He hoped that the progress would be greater in the next few years than in the past.

He then moved the adoption of the report and the election of officers and committee, whose names were read out by the Secretary.

MR. H. R. FOX BOURNE (*Secretary of the Aborigines' Protection Society*) seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

MR. J. E. ELLIS, M.P., referring to the late Mr. Arthur Pease, and the appointment of his successor, said that he welcomed the appointment as President of this Society of one who bears an honoured name, and inherits great traditions and great responsibilities, and regarded the admission of Sir Fowell Buxton as President, and the incoming of Mr. Buxton as Secretary, as a happy augury for good in the future of the Society. (Applause.)

In moving the first Resolution,\* Mr. Ellis quoted one of the chief aims of the Society, as set forth in its Constitution: "To obtain the unequivocal recognition of the principle that the slave, of whatever clime or colour, entering any portion of the British dominions, shall be free, the same as upon the shores of the United Kingdom; and to carry this principle into full and complete effect."

Mr. Ellis then said: This is the aim, I suppose, that we all have before us, and the means by which you seek to bring that about are not, if you will allow me for a moment to traverse what was said, of a merely humble character. Those means are of the highest nature.

It is laid down, I believe, in the constitution of this Society, that force is eliminated altogether from the sphere of its operations; that you rely upon the enlightenment of public opinion; that what you desire to do is, not only to supply us humble Members of Parliament with the pabulum and information for our action in the House of Commons, but that you have before you the enlightenment of the public of these Islands, and all who have a part in the settlement of the affairs of this great Empire.

Now, no one can reflect upon these things without acknowledging that enormous changes have taken place during the 60 years that have elapsed since this Society was founded.

Abroad we have seen during that time the rise of great self-governing colonies, rivalling even European States in their populations, and exchequers, and means. We have seen the principle of protectorates developed to a degree entirely unknown to our forefathers; we have seen—and I mention it myself as my own personal opinion—we have seen, with regret, the redevelopment of the

---

\* The text of the Resolutions is given in the Letter to Lord Salisbury at p. 76.

principle of Chartered Companies throughout the world by Great Britain ; we have seen colonies expanded. We have, in fact, multiplied not only the machinery of government to an incalculable extent, and afforded the world a great many more instances of forms of government than we ever had before, but we have taken upon ourselves enormous responsibilities. The Chairman knows perfectly well that the problem of the relations between the white governing race in some parts of our Empire, and the large multitudes of the coloured population—in South Africa, at all events, vastly outnumbering the whites, and possibly, as far as we can see, always continuing to vastly outnumber them—that problem presents difficulties which were unknown to our forefathers two generations ago.

In passing, I may point out this fact, which is not appreciated, that you cannot give to these great self-governing colonies the large powers of self-government that we have, and yet interfere with them in matters in which we differ from them ; and anyone who knows the state of things in some parts even of Australia, but more frequently in South Africa, must acknowledge that the opinion of the governing race with respect to the promotion of the coloured populations is not all that we, staying at home, would wish it to be. But at home there has been a very great change, and I do not think that that is sufficiently borne in mind.

When this Society was founded, the electorate, the governing body of this kingdom, was of very small numbers. When those honoured men, the late James Cropper and Joseph Sturge, his son-in-law, went round the towns and the boroughs of England to convince people about Slavery, and to develop the idea of putting an end, not only to the Slave Trade, but to Slavery, they only had to visit some 30 or 40 centres of population, to find out the views of a few clergymen, Nonconformist ministers, and members of the various denominations to the number of 40 or 50, whom they convinced ; the small electorate of that particular borough or place was very much pained, pressure was brought on the Member of Parliament, and the battle was half won. But what have you now ? Nearly 7,000,000 of people. I speak as one who has been in the House of Commons for a number of years, who has fought four elections—and won them too—and I say distinctly, that the question of Slavery is hardly ever mentioned ; I could remember twenty other questions about which our forefathers fought sixty years ago, some of which are hardly ever mentioned now, and other Members of Parliament know perfectly well that this is the case. And this is one of the problems before us. It is not insuperable by any means. I believe the electorate never was more responsive than when these facts were placed before them. I never find that any movement in favour of Anti-Slavery is received otherwise than with emphatic approval, even by my opponents.

In the African Continent we have before us very great difficulties. But fixing our eyes for a moment or two at Zanzibar and Pemba, to which your report particularly alludes, I think we are entitled not only to express our disappointment, but we are entitled to urge that the Government of the day, no matter whatever Government it is, and making no distinction whatever of party

in this matter, should have carried out what we know to have been the aim of the proclamation of the Queen to which you allude.

We have had a large number of Blue Books laid on the table in the House and distributed among the members. I must say that I have read with very great regret the tendency in the official utterances of those servants of the Crown and country, throughout those Blue Books, to develop a certain animus in favour of Slavery against those who are labouring for Anti-Slavery, and to draw subtle distinctions which won't hold water in the mind of an average individual for a single moment. (Applause.)

I regret extremely (I have said this in the House of Commons and I feel bound to say it here now, and it has been said by one of the most prominent members of the present Government) that the Government do not see their way at once to find some other field of service for Sir Arthur Hardinge. (Loud applause.) Look to the north of Africa, to Egypt, and see what has been done there by Lord Cromer, that remarkable man, than whom I believe there is not a greater foe to Slavery in all its forms in our country. One does not wish to speak disrespectfully, but I have said very much the same thing in his presence, and therefore I make no apology for saying it here; that rather voluble young man, who is now an Irish peer, and who was Under-Secretary of State in the House of Commons, used to treat us to lectures on the subject of Slavery which some of us rather resented. I am very sorry to notice a certain tendency in his successor, Mr. Brodrick, to lower the feeling and opinion in this matter of Slavery. On the 22nd of March in this year (and it is worth the attention of every one who is interested in this matter to read and re-read what took place in the House of Commons on that occasion), Mr. Bayley and with him the late Attorney-General, Sir Robert Reid, brought before the House that case which was presided over by Mr. Lloyd, the British official, when, in the presence of British officials, and in consequence of words uttered by him, persons were handed back to Slavery. This, I submit, was a direct violation of the law of Great Britain.

I cannot understand the position taken up by the present Attorney-General in this matter. Lord Salisbury sent out to Zanzibar these words:—"The Attorney-General has laid down that a British subject anywhere, in whatever service or employment he may be engaged, if he takes part in restoring to his master any person who is a fugitive slave, is breaking the British law and exposing himself to penalty."

Lord Salisbury went on to say: "I have to inform you for your personal guidance" (these were the words of the Prime Minister of this country) "you should conform your conduct to the law thus laid down."

I said, and I think you will agree with me, that Mr. Lloyd broke the law in the course he took. He read a judgment saying those people were slaves, and go back to Slavery they must. Well, that surely is taking part in sending a person back to Slavery. The Attorney-General raises what I venture unhesitatingly to term a quibble. He says that for a British official, sitting as a magistrate in a

court with a person before him, whom another person before him is demanding to go back into Slavery, to simply expound what is the local law, is not to contravene the principle that he formerly laid down ; but I venture to say that this is repugnant to any person of any sense. If ever a magistrate in a court of justice lays down the law in a British Protectorate that a person must be restored to Slavery, he is taking part in handing that person over to Slavery. I am perfectly satisfied that that will commend itself to the judgment of the people of this country as it commended itself on the occasion in question to the House of Commons, and I think that we cannot too strongly emphasise the fact that on the occasion the dictum of the Attorney-General was set aside, and the British Constitution was to that extent violated.

I have said that our task is difficult, but not insuperable. It is to convince the House of Commons, the seat of power, and through them the Government, that the people of these islands desire that every man under the British flag shall be released from a state of Slavery.

SIR JOSEPH W. PEASE, BART., M.P., in seconding the Resolution, said : My excellent friend who has just addressed you has pleaded that he has just come from the House of Commons as some little excuse, which he certainly has not needed, to take part in this evening's speeches, as if he was unprepared for them. For myself, I must plead that I have come from a Committee in the House of Commons, and a dull sitting of 4½ hours over London Water does not add to my fluency of expression.

But first of all, I would say how grateful I feel to you, who so kindly supported my late brother in the Chair which Sir Fowell Buxton now occupies. I know the Slavery cause was one which was very dear to his heart, and it has been a great satisfaction to me to feel that my sons have been able to take part in the House of Commons on the lines that the President's grandfather and my father followed. This cause, I trust, is dear to those of his name and my name, and ever will be. (Applause.)

With these few preliminary remarks, I feel that all that we have to do is to be thorough Anti-Slavery people. There is no half-way house in Slavery ; you must either be free or a slave ; and that which the Government at the present day seems to think is possible is a kind of half-way house which has all the evils of Slavery and none of the blessings of freedom.

I, like Mr. Ellis, have been almost astounded to see that it is 60 years and 11 days since this Anti-Slavery Society was formed. There can be no doubt about it. I am sorry to say that I am old enough to recollect all the pamphlets and papers that came out when the half-way system was tried in the West Indies—the apprenticeship system—and I recollect as clearly as if I had seen it this morning, papers piled round my father's floor, extracts from papers, letters from the West Indies, and those pictures which were so freely circulated, and which doubtless did so much good. Here we have some doubt about it.

There were a great many plans suggested some few years ago in the United States of America, and then suddenly a political necessity stood up and claimed

its own, and President Lincoln with one stroke of his pen freed all the slaves in the Southern States of America.

Has it been a success? It would have been a greater success if it had been done earlier. But it has been a great success. I recollect, when Lloyd Garrison was last here, chatting to him on this subject, and he said, "You must recollect that we cannot expect perfection either in the white race or the black race, but remember these men that we are speaking of were chattels of the auction block one day, and they were free men at the ballot-box the next." And so it must be with these people that we now speak of. There is no half-way house in it. They must either be free and citizens, or they must be slaves; and, therefore, I do believe that that which has been proved in the West and certainly in the Southern States of America, and, no doubt, in the West Indies, that free labour is best for the State, will soon find its force in Pemba and Zanzibar. The quantity of cotton from the Southern States of America, I suppose, is three or four times what it was in Slavery, and the little cultivator in the aggregate is the large cultivator of the olden days.

But the happiness of freedom is what we want to place before the people of Pemba and Zanzibar, happiness gained for them, not by force of arms, but, as our ancestors said 60 years ago, "by means which are of a moral, religious, and a pacific character."

We all of us believe in that Missionary enterprise which is doing so much, and this year is helping, and rapidly helping, I trust, the people of these Islands into a state of freedom, and a better state, when freedom comes, as regards religious influence, and religious thought, and religious practice.

I can only say that I am one of those who are ready to aid, so far as my humble part goes, my colleagues in the House of Commons. And I am thankful to say that we are agreed on both sides of the House of Commons. Anti-Slavery is not a party question—it is a moral question—and I believe it is a thoroughly honest and sound commercial question.

Therefore, for all these reasons, I trust and hope that this Society will still persevere. It has done and accomplished a great deal in the past, and step by step we intend, and I am sure those who follow some of us intend, that that which is stated, and which has been already quoted, shall be the principle, "that the English flag has never waved over a slave." (Loud applause.)

REV. R. WARDLAW THOMPSON: I am glad to have the opportunity of supporting this Resolution. We are asked to express our thankful satisfaction with the work which this Society has done during the last sixty years. I think we have abundant cause to be thankful. There is no need to be anxious or troubled because we have not gained all the victory yet. Mr. Ellis has referred to the fact that the Anti-Slavery question is not now a living question with the great constituencies of England, though any reference to the subject meets with respectful and sympathetic hearing.

Why is the Anti-Slavery question not a living question? Simply because of the work done by this Society. The evils of Slavery in the old days when it was

so widely prevalent were so great, so horrible, so patent, that the public imagination was touched, and the feeling of Englishmen was roused on every hand, and it was easy to raise sentiment on this subject among the people; but it is exceedingly difficult to get up an active sentiment in the public upon a question which has largely become a question of principle and not of action, against great and admitted evils.

I think, therefore, that the Society has abundant reason to be thankful for the progress made, and for the results which have been gained during the past sixty years. At the same time, the public does well to remember that the work is not yet accomplished, that the victory is not yet gained. What has been said already about the position in Pemba and Zanzibar is evidence of this, and I think there are other evidences of this which we have to bear in mind.

I shall not say anything at all about what has already been referred to so forcibly, and what will be referred to again presently, the question as it affects Zanzibar; but I do want just for a moment or two to urge upon the attention of our friends that this Society should keep the public conscience awake on the great question of Slavery in the British Empire and throughout the world.

You, Sir, have spoken very justly and wisely about the necessity for remembering that evils existing in many countries can only be removed gradually, and that there has been a gradual movement all round towards removing these evils, but that the work of this Society is to push public opinion on. There are other evils existing, in our own masterful human nature, which this Society has constantly to remember, and to make the public remember.

You have referred to the ever-extending Empire and to the responsibilities which come with it. I have had the opportunity again and again of travelling about through different parts of the world, and have seen a considerable extent of Her Majesty's dominions, especially among subject races, and I have had cause to notice that British human nature is very masterful human nature, and when it comes into contact with the simpler, the less civilised, races, it is very apt, not, of course, to introduce Slavery—of course not (Slavery is impossible under the British flag)—but it is wonderful how many things there are uncommonly like Slavery which come in. We have terms such as “apprenticeship” and so forth; the actual condition represented by these terms being as near to Slavery as it can well be, without the term, and it is not at all surprising.

I recently travelled through a large part of South Africa, and I had conversation with mine managers out there, and I find how human nature came out in these conversations. They say: “It is all very well for you to talk about freedom, but here we are in this country, with a large staff of skilled workmen, mine managers and others, whom we bring out from England, and whom we have here for a term of three or five years at high salaries. Unless there is labour to do the work of the mines, we are simply pouring out money for nothing, for these niggers won't work. They work for a month and then go and play for two or three months. They get quite enough money in the month to satisfy them. The fact is, we want some rule so that they can be made to work.”

Yes! One can quite understand human nature under those conditions. I am not at all surprised that our own countrymen under those circumstances are tempted to seek for some convenient way by which the large population of unskilled labourers should be got hold of and be compelled to work. They were quite prepared to pay them, but they must work, and so Slavery slips in by a back door unless we take care.

Mr. Thompson went on to refer to the labourers brought down to the Cape Colony from Bechuanaland, and remarked that of the men who had the lead in that matter, he knew one or two to be men of high principles, Christian men, who repudiated the idea altogether that the people were slaves, and had done their best to make the condition of these people in their present servitude more comfortable than it otherwise would have been.

This was the work which this Society will constantly have to do; to be always keeping before men the great Christian principle which is at the bottom of it all—that in God's sight all men have equal rights, and that no man has a right to make any brother man property and a chattel. We have to keep that great principle before the public; we have to drive it into men's minds, so that, as our fellow-countrymen go into all parts of the world, strongly tempted as they may be to overstep the principle, they may always have it before them and say: "No! we are free men, and our liberties have been gained at a great price. God forbid that we should dishonour our liberty as Englishmen by doing anything that should bring other men into servitude." (Applause.)

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY, M.P.: The work that has been done in the past has been to educate not only the inhabitants of the British Islands, but, I think, also the inhabitants of America, that Slavery must not be wherever the Anglo-Saxon race rules.

I regret that there should be any need for such a Resolution as that which you have asked me to-night to propose.

The Society must see that it must almost re-organise itself to fight the great battle that is in front of us at the present time. The Slavery question to-day must be fought out, first in the constituencies, then on the floor of the House. The difficulty we have in the House, and the difficulty in the country, is that people will not believe for one moment what is still going on in Africa; and I take every opportunity, and shall do, wherever I go, to read what Bishop Tucker has written to us in a letter dated June 20th, 1898, because this gives the clearest insight, I think, into what is really going on in Africa. I read this in the House of Commons myself. I could not move a resolution, but I raised a question in the House. I read this, but not one paper which supports the Government at the present time put in what Bishop Tucker says.

Bishop Tucker writes from Mombasa, and he says that it would be well to bear in mind what the facts are.

"There is a Judge, a British subject, holding his commission directly from Her Majesty, paid for by a vote of the House of Commons, sitting in a Court-house over which the British flag flies; the whole process of the

Court is carried on in the name of Her Majesty, the depositions even being taken on paper embossed with the Royal Arms. A slave appears before him. She declares that a certain man claims her as his property ; she repudiates his claim and asks for freedom. Is she to get it or not ?”

The Court, with two magistrates who are paid for by the House of Commons, hands that woman back again, against all law, against all justice, and against God’s law, and against the opinion of the whole body of this great Empire.

Now, that is exactly what is going on to-day. Those magistrates there, who are paid for as Bishop Tucker says, are treating the handing back of slaves to their masters precisely the same as we magistrates in this country are treating drunken and incapable persons and fining them 10s. It is the ordinary course of law as we magistrates have to deal with the ordinary course of the law in this country, but it is no more legal in that country than if a black man in this country was bought by a white man and claimed as his slave. No magistrate dare in this country hand him over, and it is as illegal for a magistrate to do it in any of Her Majesty’s dominions as it is in this country.

Now, this girl was taken by a missionary ten years ago. As a young girl she was educated by this missionary ten miles from Mombasa ; she was baptized and lived a respectable life there. She goes back into Mombasa. Her old master claims her ; what does he claim her for ? She is a good-looking girl at the age of two- or three-and-twenty. She is taken there against her will, handed over by a British subject, by a British magistrate, and I will tell you this, that if that poor girl had money at the back of her, and that case was appealed against in a court in London, no judge in this country would dare for a moment to hand that girl back again, because the law is absolutely in favour of that girl’s freedom.

But that is what is going on under the British flag, and I want you to rouse the people in this country to know what the actual facts are. I know perfectly well when the facts are known what the result would be in the House of Commons, and that no Government, whether it be Liberal or whether it be Tory, can stand against public feeling when thoroughly roused on a great question like this Slavery question.

But I will also give the opinion of Sir John Kirk, and no man knows better than he. This goes back to a dispatch of March 13th, 1884. “I believe the non-recognition of the status of Slavery known to law to be essential to prosperity in Pemba and Zanzibar.”

That is in 1884, when he was there, and no man knew the country better than he did.

What has the Liberal or Tory Government done in the meantime ? Very little indeed. They have freed about 5,000 or 6,000 slaves in this island, and that is all. But there is one question which we have put distinctly, clearly, and definitely in the House ; we cannot get a division—we hope we shall be able to do so some time before long—but in answer to questions put by me and by others regarding the case of this girl, Mr. Brodrick said, on March 21st, that

the Government did not propose to make any change in the administration of the law in the mainland, and yet East Africa is a country that is ruled by ourselves and our magistrates, and those magistrates are paid for by a vote of the House of Commons.

Is it not time that we took this into consideration? May I be allowed to advise the Society to hold meetings, giving the real facts of the case, in our large towns; that we should start an agitation in the country again on this great question as it was started 50 or 60 years ago. We do not want to educate the country again on the main principle, but we have to educate the people on this principle, that we will not allow any Government in this country to remain in power, if we can help it, which admits that in any part of Her Majesty's dominions her servants are administering a law recognizing the status of Slavery. (Applause.) It is a question that is dear to the hearts of all, but I have told my constituency that it is a very great labour question, and I hope the labour unions of this country will take it up—the dignity and independence of the labourer in Africa; and as we treat, as a great nation, those who are dependent upon us in Africa, so will it act and re-act on the great labour question in this country; it will re-act in a variety of ways, and I am glad to see that some of our great labour associations in this country are taking it up. I hope also that our Christian bodies, who I think have been a little bit too lax on this great question so far, will also begin to take it up.

But if we do not take this question up, if we leave it to Chartered Companies, and worship the golden calf, if we do not with a firm, determined hand do as our forefathers did on the great question of Slavery, it will grow as the same question grew in America, and we, or our children or grandchildren, will have to pay the same price in blood and money which the great American nation paid to do away with the curse of Slavery in that country.

And then I think the nation and the Anti-Slavery Society will have lost prestige with the people in Africa who are looking to us to-day, looking to this great nation to give them the rights which they have been so long without—the rights of their own land—the rights of freedom of labour—and their own rights which our missionaries have gone over and promised them.

If we follow in the steps of our great men like Livingstone, Sir Henry Johnston, and men of that class, we shall have Africa, instead of a curse to the Anglo-Saxon races, as it has been in the past, a blessing, and one of the greatest achievements towards the end (and I hope it will be a long time before it comes to an end) of Her Majesty's long and glorious reign. (Loud applause.)

MR. ALFRED E. PEASE, M.P., Vice-President, said he had taken part in the House of Commons when the question of Slavery on the mainland as well as in Zanzibar and Pemba first came under public notice. From 1885 to 1892 little or nothing was done in Pemba or on the mainland on the question of Slavery, but he had the honour and privilege to take part in the first debate which led eventually to the Brussels Conference. Since 1892 he had not been able to do much for the cause as regards the condition of the native population either in East

Africa, in Pemba, or in Zanzibar, but he believed that during his absence from Parliament and from the country his brother, Mr. Joseph Pease, had done good work for the Society, whose services could not be spoken of too highly.

He considered it a disgrace that such a Society should have any cause to exist in the nineteenth century.

Referring to the condition of Slavery which existed in Mombasa, he considered that there never was a more ridiculous excuse than that of the officers who administered what they termed *lex loci* in that region. They considered themselves bound by some pledge to administer Mahomedan law to the country, even against the law of England. The Mahomedan *law* of the country, he said, cannot countenance Slavery—the Mahomedan custom of the country might—but he was certain that any official in East Africa who took the line that Slavery was not sanctioned by the Mahomedan law would have the support of all that was best among the Arabs and native population of the country.

He pointed out that the area of our influence had now been considerably extended. By the Anglo-Egyptian Convention of 1877 we extracted from the Egyptian Government a promise that after the year 1889 the selling of slaves should be prohibited in the Soudan provinces. The rise of the Mahdi prevented that part of the Anglo-Egyptian Convention from being carried out, but now he hoped there would be an opportunity of pressing for its fulfilment, and with Lord Cromer in Egypt, and with public opinion to support him at home, he thought the Slave Trade in the Soudan provinces could be easily put down.

After deprecating the fact that a great deal of Slavery still existed in Morocco and Tripoli, and that there was a great deal of slave-trading and slave-raiding in the Central Sahara and the Soudan, he concluded by saying that he supported the work of the Society, which had in the past brought hope to those who were without hope, help to the most helpless people and races of the earth, and brought light into dark places. He thought the work of the Society deserved the support of the whole country and of the constituencies, and of every one who believed in humanity and in manhood. (Applause.)

MR. E. W. BROOKS spoke to the second Resolution, and referred to the extraordinary position which the Government had taken up in supporting so far as they had done the continuance of Slavery in the islands of Pemba and Zanzibar.

Some years ago, when the lease of the mainland was taken over by this country, our Government undertook to support and maintain all the Arab laws as then existing in that country. Now, as Mr. Pease had pointed out, there was no Arab law which maintained the existence of Slavery; there might be Arab custom, which was a totally different thing. If our Government undertook to maintain all the conditions existing in the mainland strip of the Sultanate of Zanzibar, they undertook to do a thing which was absolutely contrary to British law, which says that no slave shall breathe under the British flag; and the only thing they could do was to find a way out of an untenable position in the best and earliest manner possible.

He submitted that it was absolutely in contravention of the law of this country that, by certain legal quibbles, some of its subjects were permitted to be handed back into Slavery, and that if the Government would not acknowledge the fact, it was the duty of the Society to awaken the country to the necessity of the Government obeying laws which were passed more than sixty years ago, and which it was determined should still continue to be observed, for the maintenance of the freedom of all subjects under our rule.

A deputation of this Society had been received at the Foreign Office a few weeks back, and he was happy to say that in a letter he had received from Pemba during the past week, information was given him that a remarkable stimulus had been given to the emancipation which is slowly going on there. What was the cause of that stimulus it was not for them to state, but the fact was manifest, that during the last few weeks emancipation had gone at more than double the pace of previous times, and he thought the Society might congratulate itself that their labour in connection with this deputation had not altogether been thrown away. (Applause.)

It was mentioned at this point that Dr. Spurrier, the editor of the *Zanzibar Gazette*, was present with Mr. Commissioner Last, from Zanzibar. On being asked by the President to address the meeting, Dr. SPURRIER stated that he did not feel at liberty, being in the Government service, to deliver his views on this occasion, but he would be pleased privately to give any information or discuss any topics relating to Zanzibar which might occur at any time whilst he was in England.

Dr. R. N. CUST, F.R.G.S., in proposing a vote of thanks to the Chairman, said that he and other Anglo-Indians looked with surprise upon Mr. Brodrick and others for the way in which they talked of Mahomedan law. There were many millions of Mahomedans in India, but the British law ruled. The Hindoos were allowed to keep their innocent customs, but when British law did away with widow-burning and the killing of female children we did not consult the Mahomedan lawyers, but passed an Act of our own Local Government. In the same way he felt that we must be firm with regard to this question of East Africa.

Dr. Cust mentioned that he had sent a copy of his recent letter to *The Times* to Sir Arthur Hardinge, whose grandfather he loved and honoured as Governor-General of India. Sir Arthur seemed to think that Slavery as it had prevailed in the time of Abraham was rather a healthy custom. There were many other similar customs prevalent in those days, but the world has got on, and there can be no doubt that Slavery must be abolished.

The vote of thanks was seconded by Mr. J. G. ALEXANDER, who then said that he thought the Committee were very fortunate to have so honoured and venerated a name once more appearing at the head of their list. He noticed with pleasure that the name of Thomas Fowell Buxton, the grandfather of the present President, appeared as second on the list of the first Committee sixty years ago, and that his (the speaker's) uncle's name appeared as Treasurer. He

was glad to think that they had inherited those Anti-Slavery traditions, and he hoped that the President's name and influence would help to get around them, with the help of the new Secretary, a very much larger representation of the rank and file of the English people of to-day.

He had been spending the winter in France, and it was very humiliating to him to see that France had got ahead of us on this question. The French Government at Madagascar, before a year had elapsed after the annexation of the country, had abolished Slavery with a stroke of the pen throughout the whole of the island, and yet England, in her protectorate over Zanzibar and Pemba, had not yet had the courage to do what France had done.

THE CHAIRMAN, in responding to the vote of thanks, remarked that the two gentlemen whose letters they had heard read, Sir Brampton Gurdon, who had himself travelled largely in the interior of Africa, and Mr. Charles Trevelyan, were two of the most recently elected Members of the House of Commons.

The meeting then terminated.

### Export of Slaves from Tripoli.

IN reply to the letter addressed to Lord Salisbury, which was published in our last issue (p. 39), the following has been received from the Foreign Office :—

“FOREIGN OFFICE,

“*February 28th, 1899.*

“SIR,—The Marquess of Salisbury has received your letter of the 10th instant, calling attention to the export from Tripoli of negroes who, although provided with letters of freedom, are practically held in a state of slavery, and I am directed by his Lordship to inform you that this matter has already been brought to his notice.

“Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople has made representations to the Porte on the subject, and Her Majesty's Consul at Benghazi has recently reported that he has received satisfactory assurances from the Governor in regard to the steps that will be taken to put the law in force at that place.

“I am, Sir,

“Your most obedient humble Servant,

“FRANCIS BERTIE.

“The SECRETARY to the

“BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

“55, New Broad Street, E.C.”

We forwarded a copy of this letter to the Anti-Slavery Society of Italy, which had called our attention to the matter early in the year. The Secretary has replied in terms of cordial acknowledgment, but he points out that the Italian agent has often before applied to the British Consul at Benghazi, bringing to his notice this violation of the Brussels Conference.

From a brief account of the work which the Italian Society has been doing in the Tripoli district during the past year, we learn how frequent this abuse of the *lettres d'affranchissement*, required by the Brussels Act, is. Fifty-five slaves in all have been rescued by its agent in different places on the coast, in some cases only after considerable delay and trouble.

It has been decided to rent a lodging in Misurata and Derna, in order to give temporary shelter to the slaves rescued during the interval in which their patents of emancipation are being prepared. Great watchfulness is necessary to prevent the masters getting re-possession of them during this period.

## Zanzibar Mainland.

### LETTER TO THE FOREIGN OFFICE.

1st May, 1899.

To the Most Hon. THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY, K.G., &c., &c.,  
H.M.'s Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

MY LORD MARQUESS,

We have the honour to transmit herewith, by direction of the meeting, a copy of the following Resolutions which were unanimously passed at a meeting of the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, held in the City of London on the 28th ult., SIR T. FOWELL BUXTON, Bart., President, in the Chair :—

RESOLUTION I., proposed by MR. J. E. ELLIS, M.P., seconded by SIR J. W. PEASE, Bart., M.P., and supported by REV. R. WARDLAW THOMPSON :—

“That this Meeting regards with thankful satisfaction the work accomplished during the last sixty years against Slavery and the Slave Trade in different parts of the world, especially in the African Continent. But it deeply regrets the great amount of Slavery which still exists, and in particular the very slow progress which has been made in carrying out the Abolition Decree of 1897 in the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba, which are under British Protectorate.”

RESOLUTION II., proposed by MR. THOMAS BAYLEY, M.P., seconded by MR. ALFRED E. PEASE, M.P. (Vice-President), and supported by MR. E. W. BROOKS :—

“That this Meeting learns with regret that Her Majesty's Government have taken no steps to carry out their pledge to abolish the legal status of Slavery at the earliest possible opportunity in the mainland of the Zanzibar Protectorate. It views with the strongest dissatisfaction the action taken by Her Majesty's officials in Mombasa, in June last, in administering the local custom of Slavery, and ordering a native Christian girl, with her father and mother, back to their former master, in defiance of the instructions sent out by the Government, in June, 1897, against British subjects taking any part in the rendition of fugitive Slaves.

“This Meeting protests against this anomaly, which is contrary to the spirit of British law, and a complete reversal of the tradition and policy of

this country, and calls upon the Government to put an end to the hesitating policy of the past few years by issuing a Decree that :—

“The status of Slavery be abolished throughout the whole Sultanate of Zanzibar, and in all British Protectorates in Eastern and Central Africa.”

In handing these Resolutions to your Lordship, we are instructed to state that the Society feels greatly disappointed at the answer given to the deputation of its members which waited upon the Under-Secretary of State by invitation on January 13th last; no explicit reply having been given to its Memorial, forwarded to the Foreign Office on December 17th, in which the case of the restoration to slavery of the slave-girl Kombo with her father and mother, who had been living for ten years under the care of the Missionaries at Ribé, was fully brought under your Lordship's notice.

This Society is unable to reconcile the action of the British officials at Mombasa in this case with either the spirit or the letter of your Lordship's instructions sent out to Her Majesty's Consul-General at Zanzibar in June 1897. The particulars of this case have strongly moved public opinion in this country, as your Lordship will be aware from the references recently made to it on both sides of the House of Commons.

This Society, therefore, respectfully calls upon your Lordship to send out further explicit instructions, which shall for the future prevent the officials in the Zanzibar Sultanate from taking any part, direct or indirect, in handing back fugitive slaves to their masters.

With regard to Mr. Brodrick's statement that Her Majesty's Government regard themselves bound by the clause in the Edict issued by the Sultan of Zanzibar on the 1st August, 1890, which declares “that the status of slaves lawfully possessed shall be unchanged,” we beg to call your Lordship's attention to the supplemental decree which was issued by the Sultan less than three weeks later, but was not made public in this country for several months, by which masters are permitted to continue the former punishments of their slaves and one of the main clauses of the Edict of August 1st was cancelled. This Decree ran as follows :—

“From SEYYID ALI-BIN-SAID: Be it known unto all men our subjects with reference to what I wrote on the 1st August, 1890, and put up in the Custom-house: If any slave runs away from his master, or does anything wrong, punish him as before. If any slave does great wrong, kills any one, or steals, send him to the Liwali, who will punish him, you will see it and be pleased. If any slave brings money to the Kathi to purchase his freedom, his master shall not be forced to take the money.

“(Signed) SEYYID ALI-BIN-SAID.

“ZANZIBAR, August 20th, 1890.”

It is incredible that this later decree can be regarded as a pledge on the part of H.M.'s Government that Arab owners shall not be interfered with in punishing their slaves, but yet, to be consistent, the so-called “pledge” would as much apply to the second Decree as to the first.

In the despatch containing instructions to Sir Arthur Hardinge, dated 10th February, 1897, your Lordship made the following statement in regard to the decree of August 1st, 1890: "It seems to H.M.'s Government impossible to apply to the detriment or loss of the slave-owner, as has repeatedly been done, the remaining provisions of the Decree, and yet to deny to him the protection of this clause, which was introduced in order to secure his voluntary acquiescence in the remainder . . . . to argue that while the disabling clauses of the Decree are to remain in perpetual operation, the enabling clause was only intended to remain effective until rescinded by a later Decree. No later Decree can cancel the rights which were publicly guaranteed by the Sovereign of the State, under the authority and sanction of the British Government; and no change or growth of public opinion in Great Britain can justify the repudiation of a pledge which was given with the knowledge and at the instance of the British Representative."

We submit that so far from the "disabling clauses" remaining in perpetual operation, one of the most important of them, namely, that which entitled the slave to purchase his freedom, was annulled almost immediately by the short Decree of August 20th, and therefore the argument of the despatch above quoted, that the enabling clause must never be touched, cannot be considered to be valid.

With regard to the pledge stated by Mr. Brodrick in the House of Commons, on the 22nd March last, to have been given by the late Government to the Sultan in 1895, to observe the law of Islam, we submit that the agreement referred to has not been published in any official document. We beg respectfully but most strongly to urge that such an agreement, if it be taken to constitute a pledge, guaranteeing the maintenance of the local custom of Slavery by the British Government, and so encouraging trade in slaves, would be in direct opposition to the spirit of British law and the traditional policy of this country, as well as contrary to the spirit of the Brussels Act, which was signed by both Great Britain and Zanzibar. The British people have never been informed of any agreement binding them to maintain Slavery in British East Africa, and it is one which we think your Lordship will admit they would never sanction, if it were plainly put before them.

We respectfully submit that the only solution of the difficulties and anomalies of administration on the mainland strip, and the only way of expediting the slow working of the Decree of 1897 in the islands, is that a further Decree should be issued entirely abolishing the legal status of Slavery throughout the Sultanate of Zanzibar, as stated in the Resolutions herewith.

By order of the Committee,

We have the honour to be

Your Lordship's obedient humble servants,

*Honorary Secretary* : CHAS. H. ALLEN.

*Secretary* : TRAVERS BUXTON

## PARLIAMENTARY.

[An asterisk \* at the beginning of a speech indicates revision by the member.]

HOUSE OF COMMONS, *March 10th.*

## SUPPLY.—UGANDA.

The debate on the vote for £256,000 for grants in aid of the expenses of the British Protectorate in Uganda and Central and East Africa was resumed by

SIR C. DILKE, who asked for some further information as to Major Macdonald's expedition, and also as to the case of the Mombasa fugitive slaves. The right hon. gentleman, on the occasion of the previous discussion, told them, with reference to the latter question, that he had communicated with the local authorities, but that he had found great difficulty in reaching them and getting an answer. He should like to know when that communication with the local authorities took place.

MR. BRODRICK replied that, with reference to the Mombasa case, he found there was some little delay at the Foreign Office in making the inquiries. Mr. Curzon made a promise to make the inquiries, but, his illness intervening, the matter was not taken up again until he was able to attend to business at the end of August. Had he known that this question would be raised he should have obtained particulars as to the date at which the inquiries were made, but he believed the necessary information would arrive from Mombasa in about a fortnight from this date.

## THE UGANDA RAILWAY.

MR. LABOUCHERE asked what was the *status* of the porters—were they slaves or were they not?

MR. BRODRICK said he had never heard any suggestion that they were slaves. They might have been slaves at one time or another; but in this case, as far as he was aware, no question of slavery arose.

SIR R. REID (Dumfries Burghs) said this point about slavery was serious. It was alleged that slaves were hired from their masters, and the inquiry had been made in the past whether that was going to be a system—the organized hiring-out of slaves. The right hon. gentleman did not appear to have recollected that circumstance. Could he tell them now whether that was the system—that the railway was being made through the organized employment of slaves hired from their masters by the British Government? (Hear, hear.) If the right hon. gentleman could not tell them he thought that he would see that it was proper that he should get information, so that the House should know that there was no direct encouragement and recognition of slaves as such in the building of the railway. There was a rather ominous observation as to the action of the Government in extending the boundaries of British possessions in Uganda. He thought that the right hon. gentleman said that until the railway was finished there was no intention of extending the boundaries. Were they to understand that there was a fixed intention to extend the boundaries in this territory at any time?

MR. BRODRICK said the question of extending the boundaries was not a question of extending the boundaries of the Protectorate, but of establishing posts at points where they might come into conflict with the natives. As to the other point, as far as he could recollect from reading the Blue-book, the question was that certain tribes should furnish a certain amount of labour for a sort of general pay which was interpreted to mean payment to masters for the services so

rendered. He could not say from memory when that system was established ; it existed long before his time, but when it was found out it was put a stop to. The whole of the labour now employed either on the railway or in portorage in Uganda was free labour, for which wages were paid to the men themselves. (Hear.)

MR. BAILEY (Newington, Walworth) wanted to know whether this money was for slavery or for free labour. Were the labourers freemen or slaves?

MR. BRODRICK said it seemed impossible for him to convey his meaning to the hon. member. (Hear, hear.) He had answered the question twice, and he did not think he should convince the hon. gentleman if he answered again. (Cheers.)

---

HOUSE OF COMMONS, *March 21st.*

SURRENDER OF RUNAWAY SLAVES.

SIR C. DILKE (Forest of Dean), in the absence of Mr. Duckworth (Lancashire, Middleton), asked the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether, in reference to the surrender, on June 15 last, to their former owner, one Salehe bin Hussein, of three slaves, a father, mother, and daughter, who had been resident for the previous ten years at Ribé, his attention had been called to the decision of the Court of Mombasa, which affirmed the legality of that surrender, and declared that the slaves had no plea wherewith to claim their freedom, as Ribé was within the Sultan's dominions, and that Mr. E. Lloyd, the Acting District Officer, was of opinion that they had always been in slavery, and ordered them to return to their master ; what action the Government proposed to take in the case, in view of the opinion of the Attorney-General, that a British subject taking any part in returning a runaway slave to his master against his will was guilty of a breach of British law ; whether the missionaries in the districts of the East Africa Protectorate had intimated their determination to intercept all similar summonses for the future, and to do their utmost, regardless of the consequences to themselves, to protect the runaway slaves who take refuge at their missions ; and whether he could explain why no reply, beyond a statement on October 10th that instructions for inquiry had been given, had been received from the Foreign Office since August 31st last.

MR. BRODRICK (Surrey, Guildford)—The papers with respect to this case have now reached the Foreign Office. They have been delayed by the fact that when the Foreign Office inquiries reached Mombasa in November last Mr. Lloyd had been appointed to a station up country. There is considerable conflict of statement as to this case. As against the suggestions in the question, Mr. Lloyd states that famine existed at Ribé at the time, and that the three slaves were brought before him by their master solely to get a formal declaration of his right to their services in return for the subsistence he was willing to afford them, and that, although Mr. Lloyd closely questioned them as to whether they had any cause of complaint, they made no objection to returning and would take no legal action to secure manumission. The opinion of the Attorney-General applied to the detention of a slave by force, of which no question arose in this instance. It is believed that since the conclusion of the famine at Ribé these slaves have now left their master again. It is not known what action the missionaries propose to take, but Her Majesty's Government, having laid it down that British officials shall not take part in returning escaped slaves to their masters, see no reason for taking further action in this case.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, *March 22nd.*

## ORDERS OF THE DAY.

## CONSOLIDATED FUND (No. 1) BILL.

MR. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I desire to call the attention of the House to what is going on at the present time under the administration of Her Majesty's Government, particularly in Uganda, where the inhabitants are British subjects under the control of this House, and where the magistrates are recognising the legal status of slavery. I will quote to the House the opinion of Bishop Tucker, who, writing on the 20th June, 1898, says: "It would be well to bear in mind what the facts are. There is a judge—a British subject, holding a commission directly from Her Majesty, and paid by a vote of this House—sitting in a courthouse over which the British flag flies; the whole process of the court is carried on in the name of Her Majesty, the depositions even being taken on paper embossed with the Royal Arms. A slave appears before him; she declares that a certain man claims her as his property; she repudiates the claim, and asks for freedom. Is she to get it or not? The court has decided that she cannot." Those are the facts of the case, and it is a sample of what is going on at Mombasa. This particular case was that of a woman who had been for ten years at a mission station about ten miles from Mombasa. She had been under the protection of that missionary station, and she had been baptized as a Christian at that station. She goes there under the protection of the missionary to Mombasa, and when she gets there her old master of ten years ago claims her. She claims the protection of the magistrate, but she is given back again to her old master. This is only a typical case of what is acknowledged to be going on in many parts of Africa, for it has been acknowledged for some time now that British subjects and British servants are given back to slavery, and that the legal status of slavery is acknowledged, because cases like this must be of daily occurrence in Uganda. Now, we have on record the very able reply of the Attorney-General to a question put two years ago as to whether her Majesty's subjects in any part of her dominions were subject to the legal status of slavery, and we have his decision that it could not be so. For two or three years since that decision the thing has been going on precisely in the same way as I have mentioned. Now, the Government have not been quite correct in their replies upon that particular statement upon which several questions have been asked. One statement which has been made by the right honourable gentleman the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs is that this was practically a case of arrangement between the master and the servant. Mr. Craufurd wrote on 21st June to Mr. Howe, the missionary, absolutely denying the statement which is made by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. He says: "After the slaves were handed back by Mr. Lloyd in his judicial capacity, the three slaves stated that they preferred to live at Ribé." Surely it is perfectly clear that this legal decision was given contrary to the express wishes of the slaves themselves. The question is a very serious one for the welfare of Africa itself. It is utterly impossible that this state of things should be continued if Africa is to be opened out to civilisation, and if countries like Mombasa and Uganda are to be made the home of our surplus population in this country. But while this country acknowledges, by the acts of its servants, the legal status of slavery in Africa, you will never get this question really and seriously settled, and until it is settled you may spend millions of money in constructing railways in that country without any beneficial results. There is the question of whether Africa is going to be a free country, and whether the blacks there are going to have equal civil rights to the whites;

and until you have got this question settled it will be perfectly hopeless to open up that country so that emigration and civilisation can go hand in hand. We have the opinion of Sir John Kirk, who, in a dispatch on 13th March, 1884, writes: "I believe the non-recognition of slavery as a status known to law to be essential to prosperity in Pemba." I believe Sir John Kirk would say now—although I have no authority to say so—that the non-recognition of the status of slavery in the whole of Africa is absolutely necessary to the prosperity of Africa at the present time. The right honourable gentleman the member for Devonshire, who has taken a very great interest in this subject, both in and outside the House, put down an amendment on the Paper yesterday that the time had now arrived for the complete abolition of the status of slavery in Africa. It must be demoralising to our officers in Africa who have to do this work, which I am sure they do not like to do; it is absolutely demoralising to this House to have this debate constantly occurring, and it is demoralising to the country to play fast and loose with this great question of slavery under the British flag in a great part of Her Majesty's dominions in Africa. I do hope the Government will see their way at an early date to take up this question, not as a pious opinion upon which they have expressed their view so often in this House, but with a firm determined hand, so that we may get rid once and for ever of the greatest curse Africa has ever known. I hope, and sincerely hope, that before this debate closes we shall have a statement from Her Majesty's representatives clearly setting forth what their policy is and what it is they intend to do on this grave subject. While I am calling attention to it to-day I can tell the Government that this is a question that the country when it knows the real facts will not let sleep, and I hope that the Government will take the question in hand in the spirit in which they know the country expects them to do, and I hope, sir, to-day we shall have such a reply from Her Majesty's advisers as will do away with this matter and dispose of this grave and serious question to which I have referred.

MR. MCKENNA (Monmouth, N.) agreed that they ought to have it definitely laid down what the state of the law was as regarded the question of slavery in the ten miles strip, and they should be told whether, as a matter of fact, in a British protectorate administered by a British representative slavery was allowed. (Hear, hear.)

SIR R. REID (Dumfries Burghs) thought it right the Government should have some opportunity of giving to the House information regarding the serious case of, as he thought, a breach of the law in relation to slavery that had already been brought to the attention of the Under-Secretary. He supposed the House had not altogether lost its interest in slavery, and he was sure it had not altogether lost its interest in requiring obedience to the law on the part of persons who were administering justice in the name of her Majesty abroad, and for whose conduct this country had, of course, to take responsibility. He was not going to affirm the facts absolutely, because he knew that statements which were brought before them ought always to be regarded with a certain degree of reserve, and if the responsible Minister was able to contradict them they were always extremely glad. But the circumstances of this case were such as did require either the affirmation that they were untrue, or a distinct repudiation of them by the Government, and a promise that this sort of thing should never happen again. He would shortly state the facts. A young woman had lived for years within the mainland strip and she had gone to Mombasa, where she was detained by her former master. Thereupon the missionary called the attention of the British authorities to the matter. Soon after the mother and father of the girl were required to attend, and the slave-master, in territory over which her Majesty

had authority, having got them under his control, went to the British court and claimed that they were all three his slaves. Unless the letters which had been placed before him were all forgeries, Mr. Lloyd, who was the acting district officer, found himself unable to do anything. The three people were declared to be lawful slaves. Sir R. Reid then read the records of the proceedings before the court and the correspondence in support of his statement, and, proceeding, called special attention to the statement that the three slaves declared that they preferred not to return to slavery. (Hear, hear.) He hoped the Under-Secretary would note that fact. Notwithstanding that, these people were required by Mr. Lloyd to go back to their employer. These were the facts as he knew them, and he repeated that if there were any others which qualified them they were not known to him. As to the law, he affirmed that the whole thing was a violation of the law of this country. (Cheers.) He said that it was unlawful for any British subject to do what had been done in this case, whether done at Zanzibar or Constantinople or any part of the habitable world. There were two kinds of laws, some local, others which followed British subjects wherever they go. But he did not ask that he should be accepted as an authority. He quoted a declaration of the Attorney-General in 1897 in support of his view, and he said that what he wanted to know, as one not opposed to the Imperial idea, was whether the corner-stone in Africa was to be personal domestic slavery. (Hear, hear.) He did not blame the officials; it was evident they felt that they were discharging a disagreeable duty.

MR. BRODRICK (Surrey, Guildford): I am sorry to interrupt the honourable and learned gentleman, but I think he could not have been in the House last night when I said we had now received information.

SIR R. REID said he read the right honourable gentleman's statement in *The Times* this morning, but it was important that they should have explicit information, and he did not think they had yet had explicit information. He understood that the right honourable gentleman had received information, not from the officials in question, but from an undisclosed source, to the effect that these people wanted to go back to their masters because there was a famine in Ribé. That information was inconsistent with the letter he had read to the House, and he did not understand that the right honourable gentleman had received that information from any official source. The right honourable gentleman also stated on the previous night that it was not intended to make further inquiries into the subject. He hoped that that decision would be recalled. He did not wish to censure the Government or the right honourable gentleman himself. His purpose was to try and get the influence of the House so applied that it would be impossible for this kind of thing to go on in the future. It was a violation of the law and a departure from the best traditions of this country for many years, and he sincerely hoped that gentlemen on both sides of the House would endeavour to make it impossible that that departure from our ancient traditions should continue.

\*MR. BRODRICK: I waited a moment before I rose, in order to see whether any other honourable gentleman desired to address the House upon this question. The honourable and learned gentleman has concluded his speech with an impassioned appeal, and has complained of the time which has elapsed since this particular case was brought before the House. The difficulty, as I have explained on several occasions already during this Session, has not been due to any desire on the part of the Foreign Office to burke inquiry. The promise was given by Mr. Curzon in August last, the day before he was taken ill, and the matter was allowed to stand over until he was able to resume his duties at the Foreign Office in September. In consequence of the great length of time

involved in communication with Mombasa, and the subsequent fact that Mr. Lloyd, the officer in question, had been promoted to an inland station, and had already gone up country, some delay was caused, and we only received the actual dispatches three or four days ago. I do not wish, after what has fallen from the honourable and learned gentleman, to suggest that there has been any exaggeration on the part of those who have furnished information with regard to this particular case, but, at the same time, there is very considerable conflict of statement between the officials and the missionary, Mr. Howe, as regards the actual facts of what transpired. There is no doubt that the three slaves who had escaped from their master, and had been for some time living in Ribé, were claimed by their master, and an investigation was held before Mr. Lloyd with regard to them. The allegation in all these cases is that the slaves have been forced to return, and the suggestion is made that they had escaped from a cruel bondage, to which British officers have returned them. I hope I shall not be considered unsympathetic in regard to these cases which have been brought forward if I say that a great many of these statements must be taken *cum grano salis*. It must be recollected, in the first place, that no cruelty can possibly go on between master and slave without that slave having redress in the court. If a slave can prove any act of cruelty on the part of the master he can go to the court, and he will receive manumission at once. The idea that a slave has been cruelly returned to bondage therefore falls to the ground. Then comes the question whether he should be returned at all. With regard to that the honourable and learned gentleman's argument carries him a great deal further than, I am sure, he himself would be prepared to go. The honourable and learned gentleman says: "Why do we maintain slavery in Zanzibar, or on the mainland of East Africa, when we have abolished it in India long ago?" In the first place, the honourable and learned gentleman, I believe, is wholly in error in stating that we ever abolished slavery in India. The conditions in Zanzibar at this moment are legally infinitely more favourable to slaves than they have ever been in India, although Zanzibar is only a protectorate under the British Crown, while in India we are dealing with provinces directly under the British Crown. The Act of 1843, to which, I suppose, the honourable and learned gentleman refers, was certainly quoted by him with legal accuracy. But that enactment forbids the buying or the selling of slaves. It provides for their status before a court, but it does not prohibit the possession of slaves.

SIR R. REID: The language I quoted was taken from the section of the Indian Act of Parliament. I will get it if necessary.

\*MR. BRODRICK: I have not got the Indian Act here, but the honourable and learned gentleman will not deny that its provisions prohibit the selling and buying of slaves. That is exactly the case at the present time on the mainland in East Africa. What the honourable and learned gentleman leaves out of his calculations is this—that the declaration under which we undertook the protectorate and under which the Sultan of Zanzibar undertook to hand that protectorate over to us absolutely prevents our abolishing without some compensation the status of slavery in Zanzibar and the mainland. In the decree of 1st August, 1890, in which this country took over the government of Zanzibar, it is stated that all slaves possessed on that date by the subjects of the Sultan "shall remain as they are at present, and their status shall be unchanged." The honourable and learned gentleman says we can do what we like to-morrow in Zanzibar. I say we can do as we like only by violating the pledges which we have given to the Sultan, under which we undertook the protectorate.

SIR R. REID: Why did you give these pledges?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What was the date of the decree?

\*MR. BRODRICK : The 1st of August, 1890. If the honourable gentleman asks that question with a view to discovering under which Government that decree was made, I venture to remind him that in 1895, a few days before the late Government left office, Lord Kimberley gave, as regards the mainland, an absolute pledge that the law of Islam should be maintained, and that no change should take place. We have, then, these two declarations staring us in the face, and, though it is extremely easy to get up on the other side of the House and make a strong appeal to the sentiment of the English people, there is one thing which is paramount in this case, and that is that we should observe the conditions under which we pledged ourselves, and in administering the law we should have regard to those pledges. In regard to this particular case, the honourable and learned gentleman has stated that those slaves were returned unwillingly; that they were forced to return under the influence of great pressure. The facts I believe to be these, and I state them from the information of the officials. Sir Arthur Hardinge writes :—"These slaves made no objection to returning to their master. I understand, indeed, they were desirous of doing so, in order to get food; that the famine at Ribé at the time was severe; and that the master bringing the matter into court was due to his wish to get a formal declaration of his legal right to their services in return for the subsistence he was willing to afford them." That is an intelligible explanation of what occurred. Then it is stated by the missionary that, except in an English court, this would not have been done at all. I think, under all the circumstances which exist, the right of the master to these slaves could have been made patent. But I think a good deal of this case falls to the ground if it is proved, as we are told on the authority of a native missionary, that when the famine ceased at Ribé, a few months afterwards, the two women slaves escaped from their master, who has not since claimed them, and the male slave ran across the boundary, and took service as a porter, and is now receiving wages in that capacity.

SIR R. REID : Is that the statement of Sir Arthur Hardinge?

\*MR. BRODRICK : That is reported to us as having been stated to the officials there by a native missionary. It is expressly stated that Sir Arthur Hardinge had not had time to get confirmation of it before the mail left. As regards the whole question, I should like to put this consideration before the House. We are dealing with a very difficult problem on the mainland of East Africa. The experience in Zanzibar up to this time of the abolition of the legal status of slavery has been very satisfactory. A larger number of slaves have claimed their freedom—about 8,000 in the first year—three quarters—and a very considerable number more have made agreements with their masters, and are working for a wage, or for the consideration of occupying land for nothing. The progress has been quite as rapid as is desirable in the interests, not only of the island, but of the slaves themselves. I think some gentlemen are under the impression that the transition from slavery to freedom is a transition which is to be desired in the case of every individual who is nominally in slavery. I am not quite certain that to release a vast number of slaves at the same moment is desirable. What we are striving to do is to relieve those held in slavery from the curses of slavery as they are understood in this House—curses which we have been trying to remove for many years past in all parts of the world, and every slave in Zanzibar knows he can go to court and get his freedom. That is not denied by the missionary. It was denied, but it is not now denied.

MR. BAYLEY : That is on the island; not on the mainland.

\*MR. BRODRICK : No, on the island. Emancipation is ready to hand. In any case of cruelty a slave has only to go to the court to get manumission. The children of those who remain in slavery on the islands when they can be

emancipated are born free. There is among the slaves something which I believe honourable members will not readily credit; there is, strangely, an attachment, at all events, to the place in which they have been brought up and the status to which they have been accustomed, that is not altogether sentimental, extraordinary, as they seem to us. As long as slaves remain in slavery their masters under every circumstance manage to feed and house them. Cases have been numerous in the last few months, when famine has taken place, where those slaves who had run away and had obtained their freedom have been unable to find labour, and have been forced either to return to their masters or to subsist on charity. It must be understood that people in a condition of slavery have very slight ideas of the benefits of freedom, and they look at two things particularly, food and housing, and both these they obtain from their master. That is the reason, we believe, and the missionaries agree, why so large a number of slaves on the islands who might obtain their freedom do not claim it. It is the experience of those who have been working among the slaves that the slave is strangely content in bondage, and I honestly admit that, as regards Zanzibar and Pemba, the desire of the Government in the interests of the slaves themselves is not to make them discontented as a body, but more to secure them from the disadvantages of slavery, so that a gradual transition may take place. One of the results, when a considerable manumission takes place, is that slaves who have obtained their liberty have at first refused to work. All that has been avoided at Zanzibar. With regard to the mainland, it may be asked, if the results have been so good as this on the islands, why cannot we abolish the legal status on the mainland? and that seems to me to be a far more important question than the individual question of two or three slaves whose slavery has been resumed under whatever circumstances. There is a difference between Zanzibar and the mainland; the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba are within a limited compass, the mainland is a vast territory as to which the legal status of slavery still exists in the strip along the coast some 250 miles long, and the population involved on the coast and in the interior is very large. Then the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba are quiet, while the mainland is contiguous to regions which have been unquiet during the last three years. Putting all these facts together, I believe it would at this moment be the height of unwisdom to seem to go back or to break faith in any way with the Arabs on the mainland strip. We are tied by the announcements made by the decree of 1890, and again by that of 1895, and I would ask the House to consider this, that we have gone much farther in this protectorate than we have gone in any Mahomedan country with which we have had to deal. In the case of India, upon which I will say a word later, we took years to stop importation. On the mainland of Africa the importation and the selling of slaves has been stopped. All children born since 1890—that is, all children of nine years old and under—are born free; all slaves who have been illegally imported, or who can prove that they are illegally held, can go before tribunals and obtain their freedom. The slave and the free man stand equal as regards the laws, and what is penal if done to a free man is penal if done to a slave. Therefore, we have gone a very long step forward, and I think the best evidence of that is that during a period of no less than three years only one or two cases from the whole of that vast extent of country have been brought before the House in which there has been any injustice or any case of cruelty. We do not depart from the pledge given by my right honourable friend the First Lord of the Treasury, who has said that he would, at the earliest possible opportunity, extend to the mainland the change already carried out on the islands; but I submit that the state of the mainland at this moment is such that it would be foolhardy in the extreme to attempt to

force the position, and to cause such a dislocation as must occur in the labour market from a general manumission of slaves. At the present moment it is impossible for the Arabs to obtain free labour, having regard to the drain caused by the railway, on which high wages are being paid, which makes free labour almost unobtainable by the Arabs. It must be remembered also that we have no right in this Protectorate to cause the whole of the islands to fall out of cultivation. The crops in Zanzibar and Pemba last October were extremely well picked in one island by free labour, owing to an arrangement made by the Arabs with those who have been their slaves, or who might have ceased to be their slaves. What will be the attitude of the Government in the future in regard to that? may be asked. Well, I have stated several times to the House that we cannot break our pledges to the Sultan?

DR. CLARK (Caithness): Is the right honourable gentleman aware that by treaty with us the Sultan had agreed to abolish slavery long before the British Consul gave that illegal promise.

\*MR. BRODRICK: I should like to see that statement supported. I believe the honourable gentleman is entirely in error. What the Sultan undertook to do was to prohibit the importation of slaves, and that was done, but what we undertook to do when the Sultan placed his dominions under our protectorate was that we would not interfere with the legal status of slavery nor with the Mahomedan law. The interference that has taken place in Zanzibar and Pemba has only been carried out by subsequent agreement with the Sultan himself, but he is in an entirely different position with the Arabs on the mainland. Manumission is a good thing, and is the end of all our endeavours, but the honest observance of our pledges to the Sultan is also very important. With regard to the action of British officers the honourable and learned gentleman has laid down in the strongest possible way what his views of the law are. He says the whole thing is a violation of the law of this country, and that if there is a local law there are also other laws which follow the British subject wherever he may go. Under what statute does he make that declaration?

\*SIR C. DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean): The Attorney-General laid it down.

COMMANDER BETHELL (York, E.R., Holderness): The Attorney-General laid down the law, and the right honourable gentleman promised to circulate the opinion among the members of the House.

\*MR. BRODRICK: On 24th June, 1897, the Attorney-General said: "If a British subject did in fact detain a slave, it mattered not whether in a foreign country or on British territory, that was not in accordance with the law." Detaining a slave is not necessarily equivalent to restoring a slave, but that is very different to the interpretation put upon it by the honourable and learned member opposite. I do not think there is any question here of any British subject detaining a slave. If there is any statute which makes it an offence for a British subject to sit in court under a Mahomedan law to carry out the local law, I want to know what it is. We are determined to go to the extreme possible limit in considering sentiment in this matter, but after all, we must know what the statutes are which the honourable and learned gentleman says follow British subjects wherever they go.

\*MR. MCKENNA: Is not the right honourable gentleman aware that he is quoting the words, as I understand them, of the present Attorney-General?

\*MR. BRODRICK: My point is this, that to say that the action of a British court in administering the local law is contrary to the common law of the land shows total ignorance of what has been stated by the Attorney-General. The question is as to whether a British subject is to administer the local law if

he finds himself in a court in which the local law is established. We want something more than the right honourable gentleman's *obiter dictum* on this subject, and we want to know upon what statute he bases his statement.

SIR C. DILKE : The Slave Trade Act of 1834 and the Slave Trade Act of 1843 taken together.

\*MR. BRODRICK : Well, as to these, I might quote strong opinions pronounced by that learned judge, Lord Stowell, and by the eminent American Judge Storey, which are at variance with that expressed by the honourable and learned gentleman—and I maintain that there is not a unanimity of legal opinion in favour of the contention of the honourable and learned gentleman. We wish, in carrying out our desire, to act with certainty within our engagements. Lord Salisbury has therefore given directions that no British official shall assist in sending back persons to slavery. But that does not control the native courts, and if facts come before them that a slave is claimed by his master, the Sultan's law cannot be interrupted unless some of the numerous reasons can be substantiated by which the slave obtains manumission. We are most anxious to proceed to the extreme limit in every case, but we must have regard to the undertakings of Lord Salisbury and Lord Kimberley that the law of Islam shall be observed, and that obligation we have endeavoured to carry out. Let me say, in conclusion, that difficulties in this matter are extremely great, and the progress we make must to a certain extent be slow, but that the progress we are making is not unreasonably slow papers now before Parliament and others we propose to lay on the table before long will show. We go to the extreme point we can in our desire to get rid of slavery. We are pushing forward emancipation, but, in endeavouring to accomplish our aim, we have to consider that our sympathies shall not lead to the mainland of East Africa under our rule being in a worse state than before we assumed the protectorate.

MR. BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) : I hope the House will allow me to say a few words—because in this question of slavery I take great interest—in answer to some of the observations made by the right honourable gentleman. He touched upon several points, which I will deal with one by one. The first was the question, raised by my honourable friend below the gangway and emphasised by my honourable and learned friend beside me, with regard to slavery. That, to my mind, is a very serious one indeed, and I cannot say that I think the right honourable gentleman has dealt with it in a manner that will in any sense of the term exonerate the officials in the position they have taken in regard to it. He said that there was a conflict of statement. I have listened with great attention to what has been stated, and I cannot see that there has been any conflict of statement in regard to what actually occurred. Mr. Lloyd, the official who was interested in the matter, has himself said—and my honourable friend has read the sentence from the correspondence—that the slaves knew that it was their duty to return to their master, but that they preferred to live in Ribé. That seems to me to bring them under the first *dictum* of the Attorney-General—namely, that no British subject had any right to detain a slave or hand a slave over to his master. But, assuming—and I am ready to admit—that these slaves raised no objection to return to their master, I say that it does not make the case of Mr. Lloyd, or of the Foreign Office, or of the British officials, one whit the better. The right honourable gentleman was asking us just now what was the extent to which he went in saying that no British officer had any right to hand a fugitive slave back to his master. We base this proposition on the words of the Attorney-General himself.

\*MR. BRODRICK : The question I asked was under what statute the honourable and learned gentleman based his very strong opinion.

MR. BUXTON : I cannot quote the statute offhand ; that question does not arise. But what I want to point out to the right honourable gentleman is this, that, as far as the officials are concerned, it is not a question of statute ; it is a question of instruction sent by the Foreign Office, and founded on the legal opinion given in this House by the learned Attorney-General. Not only did the learned Attorney-General lay down the proposition in this House, but it was actually telegraphed by the Foreign Minister on the 26th June, 1897, to the British officials in the mainland in East Africa. This is the telegram sent, not only to Sir Arthur Hardinge, but to Mr. Craufurd, Mr. Lloyd, and the others interested in this matter :—"Forward to Mr. Craufurd the following telegram : 'The Attorney-General has laid down that a British subject anywhere, in whatever service or employment he may happen to be engaged, if he takes part in restoring to his master, or otherwise depriving any person of his liberty on the sole ground that he is a fugitive slave, is breaking the British law and exposing himself to penalties. I have to inform you, for your personal guidance, that you should conform your conduct to the law thus laid down.' " I say that that absolutely and entirely covers the case in point. It does not matter to us in the least whether the slaves did or did not, on this particular occasion, desire to return to the control of their master. According to the evidence of the officials themselves the slaves did desire to return, but whether they did or did not, at all events this instruction from the Foreign Office ought to have been followed by immediate action. Unfortunately, when we had the matter before us previously, the officials out there—and I am not blaming them personally or individually—allowed, I do not say without reluctance, the local law of the Sultan to override the British law. We have the Blue Books before us to show that they expostulated in the strongest way against the *dictum* of the learned Attorney-General, because, they say, it would be somewhat embarrassing ; and no doubt it is somewhat embarrassing for them to have the instruction of the Attorney-General on the one hand and the law of the Sultan on the other. Now, I am bound to say that I heard with some considerable misgiving the words which fell from the right honourable gentleman. I understood him to lay down that, under the law as it stands, the Attorney-General's opinion will have no effect on the native courts, because it is obvious that this will lead to proceedings being taken in the native, and not in the British, courts. The right honourable gentleman said, in effect, that we had pledged ourselves to the Sultan on the legal status of slavery in the mainland, and that it is impossible for us to go back from that. I can only say, if the proposition of the right honourable gentleman is correct, that two years ago a pledge was given by the right honourable gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury to the opposite effect. I do not know that I need trouble the House by reading the right honourable gentleman's words. (Cries of "Read !") Well, these are the words the right honourable gentleman used in the House on the 24th June, 1897 :—"The Government are earnestly desirous, at the earliest possible opportunity, to carry out on the mainland of the East Coast Protectorate what they had already carried out upon the Island." I am sorry to say that this was two years ago, and, as far as I can judge, not only has very little been done, but, as far as this case is concerned, obviously a great deal has been done in the wrong direction. I think I may say that the promise of the First Lord, which has not been fulfilled, is absolutely contradictory to the statement of the right honourable gentleman the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, that we are so bound to the Sultan of Zanzibar that it would be impossible for us to abolish slavery on the mainland. If I understood the right honourable gentleman aright, the only obstacle which stands in the way of carrying out the

First Lord's pledge is the question of compensation. All I can say is, that if it is simply a question of money, this House, and this country, will not let it stand in the way of the abolition of slavery. If it is a question of compensation, I am quite sure we are ready to vote any sum which may be required, but I do not think at the present moment that it is a question of compensation. I do not think that the circumstances on the mainland are so very different from those on the islands that it is a mere matter of compensation. I will endeavour to point out to the House that, as regards the question of our undertaking with the Sultan, the Government have already undertaken to abolish slavery on the mainland. What we have asked the Foreign Office to do, and more than once to do, is to show our officials out there that they are seriously in earnest in this matter. It has, unfortunately, been the case with regard to the Foreign Office that they have always been glad to find some excuse. It has constantly been necessary to urge them to take steps in the matter; they have never voluntarily moved themselves. They see lions in the path on every possible occasion, and they never take an opportunity, on their own initiative, to wipe out this blot on the escutcheon of England. The right honourable gentleman went somewhat into detail as to the extent to which the abolition of slavery has already taken place on the islands. If he is satisfied in thinking, after we have been nibbling at this question for 20 years, that the status of slavery is practically abolished in Zanzibar because, as he said, of 200,000 slaves, 8,000 have had their freedom, I do not for a moment agree with him. I think it is perfectly true that the condition of all the slaves has been improved by the abolition of the status of slavery, so far as it goes, but I do not think we can rest satisfied, as the right honourable gentleman seems to be, by thinking that we have already done enough there. I think there has been sufficient opportunity for the Government to enable these 200,000 slaves, if they so desired, to obtain their freedom. The blot to which I have referred only exists on a comparatively small strip of territory 10 miles wide by 200 long.

\* MR. BRODRICK : 450 long.

MR. BUXTON : Well, 450.† But what I want to ask the House is, whether there is any real distinction with regard to British authority over this 10 miles strip and over the rest of the territory? I think we ought also to remember that we have a railway running some considerable way up the coast. Is it really right when we have made such sacrifices for the abolition of slavery in other parts of our Empire, that we should have a railway belonging to the British Government, and paid for by the taxpayers of this country, running through a territory where the Government still allows the status of slavery to exist? Mr. Speaker, I am much obliged to the House for allowing me to make these remarks, because it is a subject on which I feel very strongly. I hope the right honourable gentleman does not think that I desire to make this, in any sense of the term, a party question or attack on him. So far as I have stated what I have stated, it has been in the desire of strengthening the position of the Foreign Office and the hands of the right honourable gentleman. I can only say that if they are prepared to undertake the risk of abolishing the status of slavery in that strip, I can assure them that, as far as I and honourable Members on this side of the House are concerned—and I believe I can speak for all of them—we shall give them our hearty support.

SIR R. WEBSTER : I have been so often referred to in this and previous debates, and so much has been put into my mouth that I have never said, that

† NOTE.—Mr. Buxton seems to have referred to the 10 mile coast strip included in the Sultanate, of which he gave the length correctly. Mr. Brodrick's figure includes the British territory to the North, which was not in question.—[Ed. Reporter.]

I hope I may say what is my view of the law. The statutes have not been correctly quoted. The words are plain and very simple. By the Act of George IV. it was provided, among other things, that persons should not carry away or remove, or contract for the carrying away or removal, of other persons in order that they might be dealt with as slaves. The right honourable gentleman below the gangway is right in saying that that statute applies to British subjects everywhere. I quite agree that that law affects British subjects all over the world. But we have got to consider what the prohibition is. When the Act was passed and made it an offence to carry away or remove—and I have no desire to whittle away or cut down my statement—it was not intended thereby to stop and put an end to slavery all over the world, for the very act of George IV., by section 17, recognised the right of slaves to go with their masters, and the right of masters over their domestic slaves. Indeed, this was recognised long after, even in the British possessions. I see no reason to go back on anything I have said. I have never said that it was illegal for a man, a British subject or not, to express his opinion, even as a judge, that a master is entitled to his slave. Now, I have said in this House more than once that that was my view of the law, and I see no reason to go back on it now. I never did say, or understand that I have said, that it is illegal for a man, whether a British subject or not, to express his opinion, even as a judge according to the law of the country, on the status of slavery. There is no section in any British statute that I know of that deprives foreign people of their rights over their slaves; but if it be attempted to bring within these words, "carry away or remove," such action as a judge, who may be sitting in a court at Zanzibar or elsewhere, in saying that a man has made good his claim to slaves, that view is, in my opinion, a wrong view of the law. It is not concerned with carrying away or removing. Let me take a case which actually occurred. One slave-owner brings an action against another slave-owner, saying that he had taken his slave away. I have no doubt whatever that it would not be a breach of the law of England to say that the slave-owner was entitled to return that slave, and to pay damages for the detention of that slave. The distinction lies between taking a person or being concerned directly or indirectly in sending back a person into slavery and the giving of a decision on a point of law as to whether a person is or is not a slave. I have said in the House, and I desire to repeat it, that if a British subject anywhere in the world, either by himself or with others, is concerned in the sending back or restoring to slavery persons who are claiming to be free, simply because they are slaves, I believe that that would be against the law. I desire it to be understood that I never did mean to say—nor does my language, fairly construed, mean—that a British subject is not to be allowed to express his opinion that a man coming before him in a court has established his right according to native law to a slave, and to intimate, by a judgment, that a man may go in pursuit of a runaway slave, and has a right to claim him by process of law. I wish to say but one word on the general question. I take the facts from my honourable and learned friend, subject to what my right honourable friend near me has said. As I understand it, the statement is made both by Sir Arthur Hardinge and Mr. Lloyd that these persons were willing to return to their masters.

MR. BUXTON: The actual words were that these slaves knew that it was their duty to return to their masters, but that they preferred their freedom.

SIR R. WEBSTER: My right honourable friend the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs states that he was informed that these people were willing to return to their masters, and that Mr. Lloyd has said that these people did not express any unwillingness to return. I am referring to the communications made by Mr. Lloyd to the Foreign Office. I do not believe for a moment that

the honourable and learned member for Dumfries Burghs considers that any breach of the statute has been committed by Mr. Lloyd. I do not agree with the honourable member for Poplar in thinking that what Mr. Lloyd was supposed to have done was either in the letter or the spirit contrary to the law which I have endeavoured to lay down in this House. May I be permitted only in one sentence to protest against that kind of exaggeration which has accompanied some of the statements made in regard to this matter. In this House, in 1897, when I spoke, I had to point out—because I knew from papers before me—that cases had arisen in which slaves who had been charged by their masters with theft claimed their freedom in order that they might not be punished for the theft, and I said that these persons were not to be allowed to be sent back as slaves. What happened? The missionaries immediately wrote that I had invented facts, and had alleged that the slaves were being detained for the offence of theft instead of being detained as slaves. It is plain that you have to receive statements made in regard to these slaves with considerable caution. Again, I say that if it be a fact that a person directly or indirectly, by his own hands or by the hands of others with his authority, forces back to slavery slaves who claimed to be free, then that is against the statute; but if he has only declared, on the facts before him, that the person claiming the restoration of a slave is entitled to have his slave, there is no rule of British law to make that an offence.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe) said that this was a matter which affected the honour of the country, and the reputation of the House, and particularly of the Government. As to the case which had been specially cited by the honourable and learned member for Dumfries, the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs did not dispose of everything which fell from the honourable and learned gentleman. The Under-Secretary said there were great difficulties in the matter. It had always been alleged there were difficulties in the way of dealing with slavery. In olden days it was argued that slaves were better in a state of slavery than of freedom, but Parliament had for two generations held that slavery must cease throughout the British dominions. The Attorney-General dealt rather with the subtleties of the legal aspect than with the plain, common-sense view of the subject. (Hear, hear.) What the House were entitled to know was, were the instructions of the Prime Minister to be carried out or not? No person, lawyers apart, would say that Mr. Lloyd did not take part in restoring these slaves to slavery. In that case, he had disobeyed the instructions of Lord Salisbury. If after this occasion there was any further hesitation in the real manumission of persons in a state of slavery, a great responsibility would lie at the door of the Government.

DR. CLARK expressed his belief that this question would never be settled so long as the present Consul-General was retained. He contended that Sir Arthur Hardinge's promise to the Sultan of Zanzibar was illegal, and that no Government ought to back him up in it. This was not a party question at all. The Governments of both parties were equally bad. The unofficial members of the House were determined that the conditions of the treaty made with the Sultan of Zanzibar while he was independent should be carried out, and he hoped they would turn out this Government or any other Government which did not put an end to the present state of things. (Hear, hear.)

SIR C. DILKE observed that it was not his intention to have spoken this afternoon, because, after the answer made by the Under-Secretary, it seemed to him the facts were too much in dispute to make it possible for them to usefully deal with that particular case at present. But the case had led to a most interesting and important general discussion upon a matter which was discussed two years ago, namely, the law applicable to this case, and it was regarding that law he wished to make a few observations. He confessed that, while they all agreed with the *dictum* of the Attorney-General with regard to the law, he could not for one understand the last words he used. After explaining the law he went on to allude to an opinion which a British subject might properly express sitting as a judge in a case in which such matter came before him. What was this opinion? Was it an *obiter dictum*—an

opinion which was to be followed by action on the part of the native court? How did the matter arise originally? How was it that the Attorney-General was asked for this opinion two years ago? Bishop Tucker brought before members of the House the actual documents issued by the courts in this Protectorate directing the police to seize the persons of slaves in the British mission. The Attorney-General had said that persons had written to the papers alleging that he had unfairly stated that some of these persons were being sought for other crimes. But in the letter of Bishop Tucker to *The Times* and in the warrants which he produced to members of the House there was no allegation that these persons were wanted by the police for other crimes. In every case the matter had reference to fugitive slaves, and it was these fugitive slaves that missionaries were called upon to surrender. They could not, because there was a doubtful case before the House, let the Attorney-General make this reference to an opinion of a judge which was to be followed by action—

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he had referred to an opinion of a judge, who decided as between two claimants to whom the slave belonged. No question of freedom arose.

SIR C. DILKE said the case brought before them was not one of that kind but cases of fugitives who were claimed for slavery, and in every case of that kind it must be illegal for a judge sitting in one of these courts to give an opinion if it was to be followed by action—that was to say, if the police were to restore these persons into slavery. The Under-Secretary, in defending the cause of the Foreign Office in this matter, had made one statement which would be received with great astonishment throughout India—namely, that slavery was worse in India than it was in Zanzibar.

MR. BRODRICK said what he had stated was this—that the position was better now in Zanzibar than it was in India in 1843, when legislation was passed which did not put the legal *status* of Mahomedans in India on so good a basis as was that of the slaves in Zanzibar at present.

SIR C. DILKE could not understand that, because in 1843 the illegal *status* of slavery in India was abolished and it remained abolished now; but it was now maintained in Zanzibar against the opinion of some of the highest African authorities in this country.

MR. H. J. WILSON (York, W.R., Holmfirth) expressed regret at the tone of the speech of the Under-Secretary. It was very much the same kind of speech that was made in that House many years ago when slavery still existed in the West Indies, and made in the American Legislature when slavery existed in the Southern States of America. It was a sort of apology for a state of things which was entirely abhorrent to the general feeling of this country. (Hear, hear.)

MR. MACLEAN (Cardiff) remarked that the statement made by the Under-Secretary suggesting that the *status* of domestic slavery in India had not been abolished would cause the utmost astonishment in that country. He ventured to say that if any official in India in the service of the Crown were to give an opinion, even in any court in India, that a man who had escaped from the *status* of domestic slavery might be returned to his master, that official would be summarily dismissed from the service of the Crown. (Cheers.) He thought they ought to have some contradiction of the suggestion, as it might be most dangerous. They had had some remarkable experiences in India lately, and it seemed now that, in addition to protection, they were also to have the *status* of slavery restored. (Cheers, and hear, hear.)

MR. BRODRICK said he was referring to the year 1843, and not to what was *de facto* the case in 1899.

MR. MACLEAN: Does my right honourable friend admit that domestic slavery does not exist in India, and that it is not connived at?

MR. BRODRICK.—I do not say it exists, and I really hope, and believe, it does not. No British official in India would think of returning a domestic slave to his master. But, as a matter of fact, I doubt whether by statute, at the time the law was altered, domestic slavery was abolished.

MR. MACLEAN thought they might, at all events, admit that slavery was not going to be restored in India, but what they wanted to know was whether it was going to be continued on the mainland of Zanzibar. He thought they should assert the common law of England, which forbade slavery in any British protectorate. (Hear, hear.) It was said that would cost a great deal of money. But they had lavished a good

deal of money in Africa on much less worthy objects, and if that was the only defence the Government could offer it was an unworthy and weak defence. (Hear, hear.)

°LIEUT.-COLONEL PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton): I have listened with great attention to the speech of the right honourable gentleman upon the slavery question, and I feel that, as far as the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs is concerned, he will do his very utmost in this matter. I will not, therefore, trouble the House with all the remarks which I had intended to make. It seems to me that the right honourable gentleman made out a case as far as he was concerned with the very greatest care and consideration. Unfortunately we know that we cannot go beyond a certain point, and certainly honourable members on this side will agree with me that the Foreign Office has done exceedingly well, and has been most successful in very many things which it has achieved of late. Now, a great amount of material and moral support has been given to the Government, but in reference to this particular affair their object does not seem to be to use the power which they have in their hands to accomplish what I believe most members on this side of the House, and also on the other side, desire to see done. This country has supplied the present Government with a great amount of moral and material power and force, and they have been able to use that power and force on many occasions with great advantage to this country. Now, this question of slavery is not nearly so difficult a matter, and not nearly so hard to deal with, as many of the difficulties they have passed through and surmounted. I want to go a great deal faster in this affair than the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and we want to go a great deal faster than the right honourable gentleman indicated that the Government would go. There is no doubt from what Lord Salisbury said that he distinctly desires to come to the point which we desire on this question of slavery on the Island of Zanzibar and the mainland, and that it should be entirely done away with. I see many members of the Government on the front bench, and I am sure that I am speaking the feelings of honourable members on this side of the House when I say that we want them to wake up and be in earnest upon this matter. We desire them to seriously face this question, and when they are in earnest they will be able to confront the difficulty and solve it. It is a question which does want solving, for it is an open sore and has been for some time. We do not ask them to draw the sword, but if they will only shake the sword in the scabbard, it will be quite enough. A great deal has been done upon this question in other countries, and surely the Government can deal with the Sultan of Zanzibar. It seems to me that if it is the opinion of the Prime Minister and also the desire of the right honourable gentlemen on both sides of the House that slavery ought to be done away with, surely it can be accomplished if the Government are in earnest and take up a strong and determined course. I think I am only stating the feeling of the honourable members near me when I state that if they would do this they would put an end to what I call an open sore and what is undoubtedly a stain upon the good name of England.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton): I need hardly point out that surprise and pain have been felt in the country at the position in which we stand in regard to slavery in Zanzibar by the explanation of the Attorney-General. Now, what does the explanation amount to? It amounts to this, that we are all agreed that no British subject, either in Zanzibar or anywhere else, can take part in returning slaves to their masters; but it seems, according to the explanation of the Attorney-General, that English officials sitting in courts where the local law prevails can express an opinion that runaway slaves ought to be returned to their masters. We ought to have had a clear explanation, for the right honourable gentleman has stated that he referred to the dispute as to the ownership of slaves between two masters. I think we are coming to a very delicate playing with language. I should like to know what is the power of an opinion expressed by a high British official in a territory like Zanzibar; I should say that the power of such an opinion is about the strongest and most important factor for the return of slaves to their masters that we could possibly have. . . . I do not know whether I shall be out of order in citing the case of Pontius Pilate. Here is a case of local law prevailing, and there is a person said to be deserving of certain punishment, and what does the Roman governor do? He refuses to express an opinion as to whether he is guilty or innocent, according to the law. He sends him

back to be tried, but he takes no part in such law. I do claim that in the administration of our great Empire and in this great matter of slavery we shall rise to the level of the Romans. I did not intend to rise, but I am quite certain when it is understood that we allow our officials in any part of our Empire to express the opinion that slaves ought to be sent back to slavery, the life of any Government will not be worth many years' purchase. We have been asked as to whether this system is to be extended to the other parts of our rapidly growing Empire, and if this is so I think people will hesitate about adding further to our possessions. I ask the Government, at any rate, to make it clear to us, and through us to the country, that no English official will be allowed in any part of our Empire to take any part in expressing an opinion as to the return of slaves to their masters.

MR. MOON (St. Pancras, N.) : In this case we appear to have a definite agreement made, and our officials are placed in a very difficult position indeed. The Attorney-General has to some extent stultified that dilemma by the judgment which he has pronounced, and therefore in that respect it is different to that case brought forward by the honourable member for Bolton in regard to the Old Bailey. The judgment at the Old Bailey is followed by that judgment being executed. But such a declaration of opinion as one of our officials might give utterance to would not be put into execution in any sort of way. I think the upshot of the whole matter is that we should urge the Government as my honourable friend beyond me did, to get rid as quickly as we can of this agreement of 1890, which is the root of the difficulty of the whole matter. When that is got rid of, then our officials will not be put into the conflicting position in which they are now.

According to the procedure of the House, there was no division. But after several other quite different subjects had been discussed, the Bill was read a second time.

---

HOUSE OF COMMONS, *April 10th.*

#### SUPPLY.

SIR J. KENNAWAY (Devon, Honiton) : The question of the continuance of slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba has been before the House on two or three occasions lately. Shortly before the recess, the honourable member for Derbyshire had the first place on the paper for a motion in regard to the legal status of slavery. The exigencies of the public service did not permit of that motion coming on, but had it done so, I was prepared to move an Amendment as follows—

“That in view of the small amount that has been claimed for compensation for freed slaves, and the disproportionate cost of the machinery for investigating claims, and the delay caused thereby in the progress of emancipation, a time in the near future should now be fixed after which these claims should not be allowed; and that the time is now arrived for the complete abolition of the status of slavery.”

In a former debate which took place on the Appropriation Bill, it was stated that this question is one about which the country is getting impatient. I am not one of those who would for a moment minimise the great steps which have already been taken, and the anxiety which has been displayed by the Foreign Office to take measures which would gradually result in the ultimate abolition of slavery. When this question has come to the front, there has always been a difference of opinion as to the expediency or prudence of taking steps at once to abolish slavery, or by going on with gradual or tentative measures. These gradual and tentative measures have been tried for some time in Zanzibar and Pemba; but the time has arrived, I think, when the country expects that, considering our position in that part of the world, and considering that Great Britain is practically responsible for the appointment of the Sultan, and controls all he does, there should be some further decisive steps taken, and that under

the British flag, which is practically flying there, slavery should no longer be tolerated. I think it is a fact that at the present time there are something like 140,000 slaves in the two islands, and that during the period that these emancipation rules have been working, practically only 5,000 have received their liberty, some of these by entering into contracts with their masters. There are thus left behind some 135,000 in a very doubtful position. Now, considering that, according to previous decrees issued, all children born of slaves are free, and that after a certain time slaves imported into the islands are free, it is a great question whether more than 9,000 or 10,000 of these slaves are legally held as slaves at all. The whole compensation paid in 12 months is little more than £1,000, whereas the cost of the administration machinery, and the salaries of officers, has been something like £8,000 or £9,000. The real question is whether we cannot pluck up courage and simply abolish the legal status of slavery altogether, as was done in India. An Act was passed in 1843 by the East India Company by which slavery was abolished. It was done in a quiet way, so that it created no disturbance, and it gradually came to the knowledge of both masters and servants when the masters found they could no longer call in the aid of the law to enforce the old rights against their slaves. The Act is very clear, and I need not trouble the House with its details. It simply consisted of four clauses, which denied any further right on the part of any one to apply to the courts of law to take action as against a slave. What is the obstacle that stands in the way at the present time to complete emancipation? I think it is the construction of a dispatch or a decree by Lord Kimberley in 1890† which said the status of the slaves should remain unchanged. But was it intended by that dispatch that the status of the slaves was to remain for ever? That seems to have been written into the construction of the dispatch; but it is a construction which I do not believe English people will be inclined to tolerate. The Government must move in the matter. We have an able administrator in East Africa in the person of Sir Arthur Hardinge; and I think his great services call for some recognition on the part of Her Majesty's Government by moving him to some other post. His prepossessions on this question are rather an obstacle to progress; and if the Government would only grant him some honour elsewhere we might get forward with this question. I do not for one moment wish to bring any charges against the Government in this matter, for I believe they have been doing their best.

MR. BRODRICK (Surrey, Guildford) said it was difficult for him to answer the speeches that had been made without repeating remarks that he had made on previous occasions.

\* \* \* \* \*

His right honourable friend near him had asked him to deal with the steps that were being taken in Zanzibar and Pemba with regard to slavery. The right honourable gentleman had said that these gradual steps had been going on long enough, and he wanted them brought to a termination. At this moment steps for the freedom of slaves were going on at Zanzibar and Pemba as fast as the slaves themselves desired. They had the opportunity given them of going to the Court and obtaining their freedom, and they largely availed themselves of it, though to some extent they hung back. At any rate they were gradually changing the state of slavery into a state of freedom in Zanzibar and Pemba. He was sorry to hear it suggested that Sir Arthur Hardinge's continuance at Zanzibar was an obstacle to progress in this matter. He believed that Sir Arthur

† The Sultan's Decree of 1890, which is referred to, was issued on the advice of Sir C. Euan-Smith, then Her Majesty's Representative at Zanzibar. Lord Salisbury, not Lord Kimberley, was in office at the time. [Ed. Reporter.]

had striven loyally to carry out the orders transmitted to him at different times, and he had had a very difficult task to perform. He had to consider the general prosperity of the population committed to his charge, and he believed that, generally speaking, he had steered with considerable prudence through a difficult period and had shown great administrative capacity. (Hear, hear.) He thought the attacks levelled against Sir Arthur Hardinge had often been made in ignorance of the difficulties he had to face. The progress of the East African Protectorate under Sir Arthur had been satisfactory in the past years. The receipts had increased and the expenditure had diminished. The receipts were expected to increase further in the current financial year and the expenditure would be kept strictly within limits. They did not intend to establish fresh posts, but to administer the country they had already taken up. They did not intend to send forth expeditions with the single exception of the expedition of Colonel Martyr, which was on its way down the Nile. That expedition had made considerable progress. The end it was desired it should accomplish—namely, that of occupying the country and establishing posts so as to connect the Uganda Protectorate with Lord Kitchener's forces—had been practically achieved. There was now only a strip of some 200 miles of unoccupied country between the last of the posts that had been established to connect our possessions in British East Africa and the Soudan. He thought in that respect, altogether apart from the promises of trade, that the policy which had actuated both this Government and the last in undertaking the charge of this Protectorate of East Africa had been fully vindicated. (Hear, hear.) He thought they could not speak sufficiently highly of the efforts of those who had been in charge when they considered the difficulties they had had to meet. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Berkeley, the Administrator of Uganda, had suffered very severely in health in consequence of the strain laid upon him in that time and was now on his way home for a period of well-earned rest. They should take care that the interests of the Protectorate did not suffer in his absence. The work begun in East Africa would be continued and would be put on the best basis it was possible to achieve both for the purposes of trade and for the humanizing influences which surrounded the British posts in Africa. (Hear, hear.) He believed if the House would have a little patience, having regard to the difficulties that had been already surmounted, they should be able to show before a very long time had passed that the advantages which were expected from these operations had been obtained, that the expenditure had been laid out at good interest, that the railway, which some honourable members seemed to think was hanging back, was really advancing at the rate of over half a mile a day, and would, within the period anticipated, be brought to completion. (Hear, hear.) He believed the work which had been done by Great Britain in East Africa would bear not unfavourable comparison with the work they were doing in the Soudan and with the work that had been done in South Africa in the civilizing influences which it brought to bear upon the people inhabiting those regions. (Cheers.)

SIR C. DILKE observed that the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs had found fault with the right honourable baronet the member for the Honiton Division for suggesting that the time had come when the promotion of Sir Arthur Hardinge might be desirable in the interests of British East Africa and Zanzibar. There was nothing further from the minds of any of them, so far as the official work of Sir Arthur Hardinge was concerned, than to depreciate his public services or ability, for which they had the highest respect. (Hear, hear.) But undoubtedly on this question of slavery he had an opinion so definite, so strong, and so frequently expressed in the dispatches laid before the House, that they could not but think Sir Arthur Hardinge might be more usefully employed than in this

particular spot, where the abolition of the legal *status* of slavery was a matter that concerned the honour of this country. The Under-Secretary suggested that the Government were proceeding steadily in the direction of the abolition of the legal *status* of slavery, and he seemed to be under the impression that the Foreign Office had done as well as the Government of India was able to do in its early days, distinguishing those early efforts from the Indian Penal Code. He would ask the right honourable gentleman, would he undertake to establish in Zanzibar and in this coast strip of East Africa the Indian law of 1843? They would not ask him for the Indian Penal Code, but for the Indian law of 1843, which in 1844 he believed was applied not merely to the British dominions proper but throughout the native States of India.

MR. BRODRICK was understood to say that the law was not so applied throughout the native States.

SIR C. DILKE could speak positively with regard to two of the leading native States in India, and the same law which was applied to British India in 1843 was applied in 1844 to the territory of these native States themselves. The right honourable gentleman had said that our hands were tied by the promise we made on going to East Africa to observe the Mahomedan law. But Sir Arthur Hardinge himself, in a recent article in the *Journal of the Society for the Study of Comparative Legislation*, pointed out that certain modifications which we had made in the Mahomedan law in those protectorates were held to be valid in the Mahomedan courts; and, again, in India, where there were 60 millions of the subjects of the Queen practically living under Mahomedan law, there was not a single slave. They did not ask that any person in Zanzibar should be removed from a state of slavery against his or her will, but they did ask that the legal *status* of slavery should not be recognised in courts under the British flag. (Hear, hear.)

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): . . . . . In regard to the question of slavery, the Attorney-General had laid it down that it was a crime for any English official or Englishman in any part of the world to aid in the restoration to slavery of any slave who had escaped; and yet, despite that declaration, it was admitted that in a great portion of Uganda the legal *status* of slavery was recognized by the courts. He thought that, as we had brought those countries under the British flag, we ought to declare that slavery must be put an end to. (Hear, hear.) The honourable gentleman said that the Arabs must have labour and that it was well that the English officials should keep on good terms with the Arabs. That was an absolute justification of slavery in these countries and an absolute justification of our officials in recognizing the *status* of slavery.

MR. BRODRICK said that was not his argument. His argument was that, if there was a too rapid transition from slavery, the whole prosperity of the island would be at a standstill. At the present moment slaves were making contracts with their masters and they were going through a very gradual process of emancipation.

MR. LABOUCHERE said if the process of emancipation went on as it did at the present time slavery would not be abolished for 30 or 40 years. But slavery was indefensible under the British flag, and if we chose to go to a country where the labour was slave labour we must accept the consequences, and, no matter what happened, we must release at once these people from slavery.

MR. DUCKWORTH (Lancashire, Middleton) emphasized what had been said by previous speakers as to the strong and growing feeling in this country against the existence of slavery in East Africa. It was firmly believed that the delay in the abolition of the *status* of slavery was due to the officials in East Africa being out of sympathy with the ideas that happily prevailed in this country.

The case which he had made the subject of questions earlier in the Session had not been met in a satisfactory manner, and the feeling was very strong among the people connected with the denomination conducting the mission that a great wrong had been done to the Africans who had been sent back into slavery. Upon the missionary work carried on at the station for 35 years a large sum of money had been spent, and many valuable lives had been sacrificed. The people to whom he referred had been free on the mission settlement for ten years, when the daughter happening to go back to Mombasa was taken into slavery again, and her parents induced under false pretences to return were similarly treated. However, he would not press the matter further at the moment, because the missionary who was on the spot at the time was on his way home, and his evidence would be valuable. He feared that, strong as was the feeling in the country against slavery under the British flag, there was not among the East African officials that keen sense of the moral wrong in slavery and determination to put an end to it by which our fathers were actuated.

---

*To the Editor of "THE TIMES."*

SIR,—May I be allowed to quote, from the Parliamentary report in *The Times* of to-day, a portion of the answer given by Mr. Brodrick to Sir Charles Dilke's question last evening respecting the "surrender of runaway slaves" at Mombasa? I always accept *The Times* report as correct on such questions, otherwise I should hardly have believed that the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs could have committed himself to the following statement as to the position taken by the Court for the surrender of the three slaves who had been living in freedom with the missionaries for more than ten years. He said "the opinion of the Attorney-General applied to the detention of a slave by force, of which no question arose in this instance." Now, sir, the words "by force" do not occur in the opinion of the Attorney-General, given in 1897, and more than once confirmed by him in the House of Commons since that date. The exact words of the telegram forwarded to Sir Arthur Hardinge in June, 1897, on the authority of the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, now Viceroy of India, and quoted by Bishop Tucker in his letter to *The Times*, published January 13th, 1899, are as follows:—

"The Attorney-General has laid down that a British subject anywhere, in whatever service or employment he may happen to be engaged, if he takes part in restoring to his master, or otherwise depriving any person of his liberty on the sole ground that he is a fugitive slave, is breaking the British law, and exposing himself to penalties."

Then followed these significant words: "I have to inform you for your personal guidance that you should conform your conduct to the law thus laid down."

Here there is no question of force at all, nor can the asserted "willingness" of the slaves to go back into slavery be valid as an argument, for we all know that no slave—in presence of his master—dare express a wish to be free.

MR. BRODRICK'S statement of the view taken by the Foreign Office of the case now under discussion, as contained in his answer to Sir C. DILKE, is singularly evasive, and far from clear. He admits that "there is considerable conflict of statement as to this case," which is no doubt true, for there always are such conflicts.

The slaves, be it remembered, were surrendered in June, 1898, and the full correspondence between the missionaries and the British officials in Mombasa reached the Anti-Slavery Society in October, and was published by them in full.

In November, the Foreign Office inquiries arrived in Mombasa, and now after four months the answer appears to have been received in London. This answer cannot be very clear, for Mr. BRODRICK states vaguely : "It is believed that these slaves have now left their master again, and the Government see no reason for taking further action in this case."

We all know that the "mills" of the Foreign Office "grind slowly," but in this instance they do not "grind exceeding small."

Yours faithfully,

CHAS. H. ALLEN, *Honorary Secretary.*

BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,  
55, NEW BROAD STREET, LONDON, E.C.,  
*March 22nd.*

*The Times*, March 27th.

### SOME PRESS COMMENTS ON THE DEBATE.

FROM a large number of opinions of the Press criticising the attitude of the Government to the question of slavery on the mainland of Zanzibar, we gather the few extracts following :—

This Government lacks nerve in dealing with slavery. Sir R. Reid on Wednesday proved conclusively that the British Government in Zanzibar not only recognises the status of slavery, but restores slaves to their owners, giving in detail the case of three women who were so restored. Mr. Brodrick admitted the facts, and could only say in extenuation that we took over Zanzibar under an agreement not to emancipate persons now in slavery without compensation, and that on the mainland we stand pledged by a declaration of Lord Kimberley to allow the law of Islam to prevail. Both excuses are illusory. England can pay the compensation if it is really promised, though a promise not to abolish burglary unless the burglars were compensated would be considered too immoral to be kept ; and though Mohammedan law permits slavery, it does not establish it. On the contrary, in certain cases it makes of manumission a duty. The plain truth of the matter is that Sir Arthur Hardinge coerces the Foreign Office, and that if he were an abolitionist, slavery would be extinct in our African dominion. We have simply to refuse to recognise the existence of such a status, and punish any man who flogs a slave as if he had flogged a free woman, and slavery would cease to exist. Perfect justice will not be done till the holding of a slave is declared to be kidnapping, which it is ; but liberty to fly makes slavery unprofitable, and when it does not pay it ceases. The excuses for it are rubbish. It is simply an unusually cruel kind of theft.—*Spectator*, March 25th.

There was a thoroughly interesting and useful discussion on slavery in East Africa on the Consolidation Bill yesterday. Mr. Brodrick and Sir Richard Webster defended what has been done and pointed out the difficulties there are in the way of doing anything in a hurry. But the general impression left was that expressed by Mr. Pilkington, the Tory member for Newton, who declared that "he was sure the feeling of hon. members on that side of the House was that they wanted the Government to wake up in regard to this matter." Last year, thanks to the publicity given to the question, the Government had to send out instructions that British officials were

not to go slave-catching ; we hope that yesterday's discussion will lead to a quickening of the pace towards the complete abolition of slavery in East Africa.—*Westminster Gazette*, March 23rd.

---

The debate on slavery in Zanzibar raised by Mr. Thomas Bayley in the House of Commons yesterday threw light upon two main points. One is that slavery still flourishes under the British flag ; and the other that the Government is not very much in earnest in its desire to remove this disgrace. The explanations of Mr. Brodrick and Sir Richard Webster are not satisfactory. Mr. Brodrick tells us that progress in the direction of the abolition of slavery has been quite as rapid as desirable not only in the interests of the island but in the interests of the slaves themselves. It would be interesting to have the opinion of the slaves on this last point. It is an illegal act for any British official to restore a slave to slavery, but Mr. Bayley was able to cite three cases in which this has been deliberately done. This fact is of more importance than Sir Richard Webster's legal quibbles which dealt, as Mr. Ellis observed, with the subtleties of the law rather than with the common-sense view of the matter. If the agreement of 1890 permits slavery, it should be set aside. It is not an agreement that should be in force in territory under the English flag. It is a blot upon the national honour that any slave should be found in the British dominions, and the feeling of this country is, we are confident, unanimous on the matter. It is not, as Mr. Brodrick seems to think, a question of sentiment ; it is a question of right and justice.—*Nottingham Daily Express*, March 23rd.

---

#### SLAVERY "NOT SO BAD."

Mr. Brodrick's reply was interesting and significant. It practically amounted to a defence of slavery as an institution. He pooh-poohed the notion that the slavery in which these people were detained was a cruel bondage. Indeed, just as the tame deer which is hunted to death is said to enjoy the "sport," so Mr. Brodrick tried to make it appear that slaves in Zanzibar have a good time. And even if they had not, Mr. Brodrick said we could do nothing for them because of our pledges to our good friend the Sultan. Slavery was in the contract, it was one of the local institutions, was legal under Mohammedan law, and therefore we had to respect it. Indeed, Mr. Brodrick was possibly unconsciously humorous, declaring that the "impassioned appeals of the Opposition should be taken *cum grano salis*," and urging that "the local status," whatever that may be, of the slave was satisfactory, and that "progress had been made quite as rapidly as was desirable in the interests of the slaves themselves." So much for the old theories about slaves being unable to breathe under the British flag ! Much more was of course said, but that was the practical conclusion of the matter—Mr. Brodrick, on behalf of the Government, maintaining that slavery is not half bad.—*Morning Leader*, March 23rd.

---

If anything were required to complete the condemnation of the Government for its attitude with regard to slavery in Zanzibar, it is found in Mr. Brodrick's speech on Wednesday. The Under-Secretary for Foreign affairs began by sneering at the missionaries, saying that a great many of the statements about runaway slaves "must be taken *cum grano salis*." It may surprise Mr. Brodrick to know that the character of men like Bishop Tucker and the Free Methodist missionaries at Ribé is,

in the matter of truthfulness, quite as high, to say the least, as that of any subordinate member or official of the present Government. . . . It is difficult to listen, except with indignation, to Mr. Brodrick's wretched arguments in favour of keeping human beings in a state of slavery, and perpetrating a moral wrong, lest by doing righteously we "cause a dislocation in the labour market" of Zanzibar and Pemba. From beginning to end of the Under-Secretary's speech there was not a single indication that he and the Government he represents appreciate the ethical import of this question of slavery. . . . If Lord Salisbury and his colleagues imagine that in this matter they can flout the moral sentiment of the country with impunity, they make a profound mistake ; and it is the duty of all who still believe that it is righteousness alone that exalteth a nation to do everything in their power to force the present feeble Administration to remove the foul stain now resting on our government of the Zanzibar Protectorate.—*Leeds Mercury*, March 24th.

---

What mainly strikes the inexperienced reader of these debates is the overlaying of principle with detail and circumstance. We are not prepared to say that, if the British Government undertakes the administration of a country conjointly with a Mohammedan Power, it may not be the lesser of evils to suppress the slave status gradually rather than cause a social and economic revolution. And probably it follows that if English officials take a share in such mixed tribunals they must administer the law as they find it. Only, if Parliamentarians had talked in this strain a generation ago they would not have been listened to. Then it was held that the complete and immediate suppression of slavery was an essential condition and a main objective to any acquisition of territory by Great Britain, and that territory was not to be acquired on any other terms. When, in 1875, it became known that Mr. Disraeli's Government had issued a circular limiting the right of asylum on British ships to fugitive slaves, the British public rose in its wrath, and that circular was crumpled up in less than a month. In extenuation of their blunder Ministers pleaded that actions for damages had been brought against the slave-sheltering officers ; but the nation utterly refused to have its reputation as the champion of freedom tarnished for the sake of filthy lucre. A breath of that spirit now would be mightily refreshing. The underlying assumption of all Mr. Brodrick's arguments was something entirely different. Nowadays the ruling consideration in all these matters is not whether a certain course is consonant with British traditions of civil liberty, but whether it may produce awkward and expensive consequences.—*Bradford Observer*, April 11th.

---

There is a general feeling that Sir Arthur Hardinge is to a considerable extent responsible for the delay in the abolition of slavery. He is inclined to take matters easy. He is a bit of a cynic ; and although cynicism is not uncommon among British public men, it is decidedly out of place and unhealthy when applied to so iniquitous a business as the slave trade. It is as well that Sir Arthur should be made aware that very many Englishmen regard his attitude towards this question with strong disfavour. Mr. Brodrick, in replying to Sir John Kennaway, urged that the British were doing a great civilising work in East Africa. Of this there can be no doubt ; but if a serious blot mars this civilising work, that blot ought to be wiped out. There ought most emphatically to be no form of slavery whatever in any British dependency. Mr. Robert Needham Cust, an ex-member of the Indian Civil Service, and now a prominent member of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery

Society, pointed out in an interesting letter which he sent to the *Times*, and which that paper for some reason did not insert, that in India, where there are sixty millions of Mohammedans, there are no slaves. The argument that slavery is an essential attribute of Mohammedanism thereby falls utterly to the ground. Mr. Cust remembers serving under Sir Henry Hardinge when that gallant administrator abolished slavery in a newly-conquered portion of our Indian Empire, and asks pertinently why Sir Arthur Hardinge does not follow the example of his distinguished grandfather. No excuse in the least degree satisfactory has been made for the paltering with the slavery question at Zanzibar.—*Sheffield Independent*, April 11th.

## Egypt and the Soudan.

### PARLIAMENTARY PAPER.

EGYPT, No. 3 (1899).

A VERY interesting and important Report by LORD CROMER on the Condition of Egypt and the Soudan in 1898 has been published in the form of a Parliamentary Paper. The Report is an exhaustive one, as it deals with subjects as various as the Financial position of Egypt, the Barrage of the Nile, the Medical Administration, Education, Egyptology, Cruelty to Animals, and the Suppression of Slavery. We quote Lord Cromer's very hopeful remarks on the latter subject, reminding our readers of the old maxim of the Society that the only thorough and lasting method of suppressing the Slave Trade is to stop the demand for slaves; so long as a demand exists, the supply will by some means or other be kept up. We greatly regret that Lord Cromer is not able to give more hope of the disappearance of domestic slavery in the Soudan for some while to come, but we are glad to note his assurance in the last paragraph that the promise given to respect the sacred law of Islam does not include the observance of local customs of slavery; if it did, the anomaly and scandal caused by the undertaking given in the Zanzibar mainland to observe the *lex loci* would be reproduced in the Soudan.

#### "SUPPRESSION OF SLAVERY.

"A few cases of kidnapping occurred in Upper Egypt during the past year. The boys and girls are taken down to the Red Sea coast, transported to Arabia, and there sold. I am glad to say that, in some instances, the children were recovered, and the guilty parties brought to justice. It is, however, very difficult to trace the individuals who perpetrate these crimes. They generally belong to the Bishareen or Ababdeh tribes. Since the reconquest of the Dongola Province more Soudanese have found their way into the Assouan district than was formerly the case. The children become an easy prey to the numerous Arabs who are constantly on the watch for a favourable opportunity to kidnap them. There can be no doubt that the traffic in slaves is aided and abetted by the owners of boats who come over from the Arabian coast for the ostensible object of pearl fishing. I am drawing the attention of the Governor General of the Soudan to this point. There is also no doubt that the Rasheida tribe, who live in Italian

territory, take an active part in the traffic. It is believed that about 50 to 100 slaves are imported annually into the Hedjaz from the coast north of Massowah. They are principally Abyssinians, with a few eunuchs. The information on this subject in possession of the Egyptian Slave Trade Department has been communicated to the Italian authorities.

"There is no difficulty in finding a sale for slaves in Arabia. At Jeddah there are twelve slave merchants. Their names are well known. I am informed that the price of slaves is : for a male or female of 14 years old, about £16 ; from 14 to 20, from £20 to £25 ; from 20 to 30, £30. In Mecca and Medina the prices are about 50 per cent. higher. Eunuchs fetch from £80 to £100.

"The number of slaves liberated in Egypt during the past year was 334, of whom 170 were men, and 164 women. This number is 400 less than in 1897. Domestic slavery in Egypt proper is rapidly disappearing.

"The facts to which I have alluded above sink, however, into insignificance by comparison with the effect which will be produced on the future of anti-slavery operations by the principal event of the past year, namely, the reconquest of the Soudan."

#### SUPPLY AND DEMAND.

"Steady progress has unquestionably been made of late years in the direction of shaking the hold which the institution of slavery has gained on all Moslem countries. This progress has been specially marked in Egypt. At the same time, I think that those who have borne part in the anti-slavery campaign must constantly have felt that up to the present time merely the fringe of the subject has been touched. Such certainly has been my own feeling. It has, for a long time past, been recognized that there are two distinct methods of dealing with the question of slavery. One is to endeavour to limit the demand for slaves. The other is to cut off the supply. It cannot be doubted that the second of these methods is by far the more effective of the two. It would be an exaggeration to say that nothing has been done in the way of limiting the demand. In Egypt, for instance, I believe the idea is gradually gaining ground amongst the slave-owning classes that free is more economical than slave labour. Moreover, I have myself known several cases where the connection between master or mistress and slave was kept up, not because the owner wished to keep the slaves, but because the slaves would not leave the service of the owner. In spite, however, of the fact that the special difficulties in the way of obtaining slaves in Egypt have developed a certain amount of apathy as regards the continuance of slavery as an institution, it is none the less true that the abolition of slavery by the method of extinguishing the demand for slaves must of necessity be a very slow process, possibly, and even probably, involving the work of generations. The operation entails a complete change in the habits of thought of the population in countries where slavery is sanctioned by law and by custom.

"Under these circumstances, attempts have naturally been made to adopt the alternative method, that is to say, to cut off the supply of slaves. Here again,

however, the difficulties to be encountered are very great. It has been found in practice almost impossible to stop all the channels by which slaves can be brought to market. Even in Egypt, where anti-slavery operations have during the last sixteen years been conducted under exceptionally favourable conditions, perfect success has not yet been attained. Cases of slaves being imported into the country are, I believe, rare, but I am not all prepared to say that, in spite of the utmost vigilance, they do not occasionally occur. I have already alluded to cases of slaves or kidnapped children who are smuggled down to the western coast of the Red Sea and taken over to Arabia."

#### EFFECT OF SOUDAN VICTORY.

"With the reconquest of the Soudan, a new chapter in the history of anti-slavery operations begins. It has at last been found possible to strike a decisive blow at the main prop which holds up the institution of slavery. So long as slave-raiders were free to roam about those provinces in Central Africa from which the slaves have heretofore been principally drawn, it was hopeless to expect that the supply could altogether be cut off. Means would always be found for transporting captured slaves to their ultimate destinations. These provinces have now fallen under the influence of an European Power, and, moreover, of that Power which, more than any other, has been distinguished for the zeal and interest which it has displayed in the anti-slavery cause. It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of this achievement in connection with the effect which must ultimately be produced on slavery as an institution. What has heretofore been the chief recruiting ground for slaves is now closed to the slave-raider.

"I do not say that slave-hunting operations will no longer be possible, nor that all channels for the transport of slaves from the centre of Africa to the coast will be closed. Such, unfortunately, is not the case. Other provinces are still open to the slave-raider. It is well-known that an active Trade in Slaves exists between Wadai and the coast lying between Tripoli and Alexandria. The Trade is fostered by the followers of Sheikh Sennoussi. At the same time, having regard to the blow which has now been struck, and to the further fact that the whole, or the greater part, of Africa appears to be gradually falling within the sphere of influence of some one or other European Power, it is not too much to say that, for the first time in the history of anti-slavery operations, there seems to be some real prospect of final and complete success. Time will, without doubt, be required; but it is permissible to hope that, under the influences now at work, the next generation will see the almost entire extinction of the institution of slavery."

#### DOMESTIC SLAVERY.

"Although there is every reason to hope and believe that the Slave Trade in the Soudan is a thing of the past, domestic slavery will probably continue to exist for some while to come. It will be remembered that in 1877 the Khedive, Ismail Pasha, signed a Convention having for its object the abolition of slavery and the

Slave Trade in Egypt. It was provided that the Convention was to come into operation in the Soudan in 1889. It is quite certain that, even if no rebellion had taken place, this Convention would have remained a dead letter. The prospects which it held out to those who were interested in the anti-slavery cause were delusive. General Gordon, when he arrived at Khartoum in 1884, at once saw the impossibility of putting the Convention in force. His declaration on this subject caused some surprise and animadversion. My personal opinion at the time was, and still is, that General Gordon's action in this matter was perfectly justifiable. He merely accepted an evil to which it was not in his power to apply any remedy. Lord Kitchener is obviously in a far stronger position for dealing with this question than was the case with General Gordon fifteen years ago. It is, however, one of great difficulty, and will require very careful treatment. I am not at present prepared to discuss it. All I can say is that the importance of the subject is fully recognised, but that any hasty or premature action is much to be deprecated.

"I take this opportunity of mentioning that the promise which I made to the assembled Notables on the occasion of my recent visit to Omdurman, to the effect that the Sacred Law of Islam would be treated with respect, does not in any way tie the hands of the Government in dealing with this matter. The Sheria is applied in Egypt, but slavery, if not dead, is moribund."

---

We have no space for further quotation of LORD CROMER's remarks on such subjects as Soudan Railway Extension, the Bahr-el-Ghazal and Equatorial Provinces, and the Gordon College. We merely note in passing that the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY urged the construction of a line from Suakin to Berber upon the Government nearly 16 years ago, and that LORD CROMER declares that "railways constitute, perhaps, the greatest want of the Soudan."

LORD CROMER concludes his long and weighty report by referring to the difficulties presented by the new problem of the rehabilitation of the Soudan provinces. He does not, however, take a despondent view of the cause of progress there, though he says that time is required, and urges that the work of reform should not be hurried. He thinks that the degree of prosperity to which Egypt has been raised is a favourable example of what may be accomplished in the Soudan, though the latter country is in a far more backward condition than Egypt was, when reform was begun under British rule.

---

## British East Africa Protectorate.

PARLIAMENTARY PAPER.

AFRICA No. 3 (1899).

THE report of SIR ARTHUR HARDINGE for the year 1897-98 was issued last month. The Consul-General writes that the history of this, the third year of the

Protectorate, has been politically uneventful, and peaceful, except for a disturbance in the Jubaland province, which necessitated the sending of a punitive expedition against the Ogaden Somali tribe. The Uganda Railway had on 31st March last reached the 279th mile. The general revenue of the territory has steadily increased, and it is hoped that if progress is maintained at the same rate, the Protectorate may within a decade be self-supporting.

We quote the following extracts from the Consul-General's Report on

#### SLAVE TRADE AND SLAVERY.

"No attempt to export slaves from the Protectorate has come to the notice of the authorities during the year under review, and the only case of a dhow arrested for Slave Trade was that of the 'Fath-el-Rahman,' a Suri Arab dhow under French colours, which put into Mombasa Harbour in September last with a cargo of slaves stolen from Zanzibar. I directed the master to be imprisoned, but, in consequence of the protests of the French Consulate at Zanzibar, received orders from Her Majesty's Government to hand him over to the Consul, and prisoner, dhow, and witnesses were sent for trial by the French Court at Réunion, with what result, though nearly a year has now elapsed since the seizure of the vessel, I have not yet been able to ascertain.\*

"No cases † of internal Slave Trade trading within the area in which domestic slavery is legal have come before the Courts or other authorities, but since the famine began to be felt this summer, the Wanyika have once more attempted to sell their children for grain, not, however, to the coast people, who are afraid to buy them, but to each other.

"The local Executive have successfully stopped this practice, and the District Officer for Malindi took the opportunity of the arrest of five natives of Giriama, three of whom were charged with selling their infant daughters, and two with buying them, to make a public pronouncement on the subject in the presence of a great assembly of the Elders of Giriama.

"The prisoners all pleaded guilty, and urged that it was an ancient recognized custom in their country to exchange, mortgage, or sell females at any stage of life, and the sellers added that only their ignorance of our laws, combined with extreme poverty, due to the famine, had induced them to part with these children in order to provide food for the remainder of their families.

"It appeared that in all three cases the children were sold not as slaves in the strict sense of the term, but as wives or concubines for the purchasers' sons, on the payment of 'Mbunda,' a sort of dowry, for them, and were to remain in the custody of their mothers pending the coming of age of their husbands, who were all three still boys.

"Of course, with these primitive populations it is often difficult to distinguish between wives and slaves, since a wife is bought for a lump sum and does all the manual work of the household, and in view of this fact and of the entreaties of the Elders that the prisoners might be treated with leniency, Mr. Macdougall merely imposed a fine of 80 rupees on one of the purchasers, who could afford to pay, and released the others, who had no means of paying any fines, and one of whom had

\* Since this was written, I have heard that the accused was acquitted.—A. H. H.

† I find eight cases of "slave dealing" among the criminal returns for Seyyidieh; but the Acting Judicial Officer tells me that these were all by aboriginal natives, mostly of the Giriama tribe, outside the Zanzibar limits.—A. H. H.

been seriously ill when in custody. The Elders promised not only to report, but to arrest any of their tribe found selling female infants in future. . . . .

"As will be seen from Mr. Lane's Report on Kitui, seven Masai women and two children, held as slaves by the Wakamba of that district, have applied for and obtained their freedom during the six months which have elapsed since the establishment of our station at Kitui. . . . .

"In questions in which rights derived from marriage and rights derived from pure purchase blend together in such a manner as to make it difficult to separate them, the task of an English officer who does not wish to recognize the latter, but is unwilling to dissolve native society by ignoring the former, is a somewhat delicate one, and he finds himself obliged to fall back upon common sense, and the general principles of tribal law or custom, where these are not fundamentally repugnant to our own views of justice and morality."

#### ZANZIBAR COAST STRIP.

"In the small area within the Provinces of Seyyidieh and Tanaland, in which Mahomedan domestic slavery still has a legal existence, 704 domestic slaves have been freed during the year under review.

"The following are the figures for Seyyidieh :—

"In the Mombasa district 146 slaves were freed in 1897-98, as compared with 41 in the previous year ; in the Malindi district 172, as compared with 53 in the previous year ; and in the Vanga district 240, as compared with 30 in the previous year. The total number of slaves freed in Seyyidieh was therefore 553 as compared with 124 in the year 1896-97. Of this number 26 were freed by their owners, 7 purchased their freedom under clause 8 of Seyyid Ali's Decree, 318 were freed under other clauses of that Decree, principally the one providing that slaves can only be inherited by the children of their owners, and 122 were freed for various other reasons, such for instance as illegal tenure. The great increase in the number of freedom papers given this year as compared with the previous ones I attribute to the circumstance that many owners have died during the period without children. Thus in Vanga, 145 slaves belonging to the late Diwan or Pontiff of Vanga have been freed with one stroke of the pen by his death, but have elected for the most part to remain on his estates and to cultivate them on the old terms for the heirs, paying a portion of the produce as rent for their allotments. Another cause for the increase as compared with last year, is due, I think, to the fact that during the latter period, whilst the province was recovering from the effects of the Mazrui rebellion, the slaves were scattered in all directions, and it was only when they returned and re-settled on their masters' lands that the work of progressive manumission could be resumed.

"In Tanaland the figures are from the 1st January to December 1897, 162. Of these 23 were freed by their owners, 125 under various clauses of Seyyid Ali's Decree, 5 by Government as runaways from Somali or Galla masters, 5 as unlawfully held, and 1, it is not stated for what reason, in Witu.

"During the first six months of the present year (the 1st January to the 30th June) 110 slaves have been freed in Tanaland, 12 by their owners, 90 under Seyyid Ali's Decree, 1 (reason again not given) by the Sultan of Witu, 5 as illegally acquired, and 2 as runaways from the Somalis.

"The total number of slaves freed since the establishment of the Protectorate in the Province of Seyyidieh is 830, and in the Province of Tanaland 470, making a total of 1,300 in three years for the coast strip, in which the servile status is still legal.

This, however, includes only those slaves who have received formal freedom papers, not those who have run away either to Mission stations or to 'Watoro' settlements, or have disappeared up-country, having taken service as porters, railway employés, soldiers, &c., and whose numbers are probably far more considerable. Numerous coast slaves have, for instance, to my knowledge, enlisted in the newly-formed 'Uganda Rifles.'

---

### Obituary.

WE regret to have to announce the recent deaths of three members of the Society. Mr. J. V. CRAWFORD, who died on February 16th, had been a member of the Committee since 1880. His close acquaintance with the slave question in Cuba during the time that he acted as H.M.'s Representative in Havana, enabled him to give much valuable information to the Committee on various points connected with the Slave Trade. In 1885 Mr. Crawford accompanied the Secretary on an Anti-Slavery mission to Morocco, when they travelled down the coast to Mogador and had interviews with some of the best known Moorish officials respecting the Slave Trade still carried on in spite of British protests. During their visit the first and only Anti-Slavery meeting ever held in Morocco was convened in Tangier, and was influentially attended. Mr. Crawford was one of the Society's delegates to the Anti-Slavery Conference convened by Cardinal Lavigerie in Paris after the conclusion of the Brussels Conference in 1890.

---

MR. WILLIAM MORGAN, who died on March 23rd at the age of 83, was one of the veterans of the Anti-Slavery Society, of which he had long been a corresponding member. He took part in the agitation against negro slavery in British possessions as early as 1831, and in 1834 he was publicly presented with a framed copy of the Emancipation Act in gold letters for his services to the Anti-Slavery cause. The visit of his friend Joseph Sturge and Thomas Harvey to the West Indies in 1837 to investigate the condition of the negroes, nominally freed, under the apprenticeship system, gave Mr. Morgan much work in endeavouring to stir up the British Parliament and people to the evils of that system, and after 1838, when freedom was fully secured, he acted professionally, as solicitor, for some of the sufferers from slavery whose appeal came before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. Morgan took an active part in the foundation of the Anti-Slavery Society in 1839 and was one of the six honorary secretaries of the World's Convention in 1840; his portrait appears in Haydon's great picture, now in the National Portrait Gallery. He was closely associated with the labours of Mr. Joseph Sturge at this time in assisting the West Indian negroes to buy land, and so creating a system of peasant proprietorship.

Many years later, in 1866, Mr. Morgan went out to Jamaica, at the instance of the Society, to assist in the investigations of the Royal Commission into the cruelties of Governor Eyre in suppressing a negro outbreak. The

report of the ferocious measures employed by the Governor caused horror and excitement in this country, and the appointment of the Commission was the result. Mr. Morgan, by his noble work in visiting the crowded prisons and obtaining the liberation of many innocent men, illegally imprisoned as rebels, did much to contribute to the restoration of confidence in Great Britain on the part of the coloured population. Mr. Morgan was active in many other philanthropic works, and his son, Mr. W. Carey Morgan, is a member of the Committee of the Society. Mr. Morgan's death was followed only five days later by that of his wife, so that a double sorrow has fallen on their family.

---

DR. G. W. LEITNER, who was a life member of the Society, died on March 22nd last. A distinguished Orientalist and educationalist, his marvellous linguistic knowledge enabled him, while founding an Indian College in the Punjab, to enter into close relations with the Kafirs of the Hindu Kush, who were oppressed and enslaved by the Ameer of Afghanistan. In 1874 Dr. Leitner was the chief speaker at a meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society in Exeter Hall when he introduced a young Kafir, an escaped slave from Afghanistan, to the audience. In 1895, when the extinction of this hardy race was again imminent, Dr. Leitner again threw the weight of his energy and powerful influence into the scale, and, aided by his experience and knowledge, the Society forwarded strong memorials to the Government, and endeavoured, by disseminating information and holding meetings, to save the Siah Posh Kafirs from enslavement. Unfortunately, political considerations prevailed, and their efforts were fruitless.

---

At the meeting of the Committee on April 7th, a unanimous vote was passed, expressing regret at these grave losses and offering sympathy with the families of the deceased.

---

## SLAVERY IN MOROCCO.

WE are informed from El-Kazar el Kebir that a woman slave, belonging to an Algerian Moor, escaped from his house a few days ago, and took refuge at the French Vice-Consulate, where, with sobs and tears, she begged the Vice-Consul's assistance to save her from the rough treatment she was suffering at the hands of her owner.

She was kindly received by the French Vice-Consul, who is investigating the case, and has promised that justice shall be done. It appears that the hardships to which this poor woman has been subjected are of such an inhuman nature that the case is publicly commented upon with great indignation among the people of El-Kazar.

As the alleged offender is a native of Algeria, who naturally is a French citizen, and as citizens of a civilized nation should not be allowed to hold slaves,

it is to be hoped that this poor woman will be given her liberty, and that, for the sake of humanity, Consular officers at El-Kazar or elsewhere will watch that she is not dragged again into slavery.

We are also informed that as a general rule, though not without exception, French naturalized or protected natives residing in Wazzan, El-Kazar, Fez, and elsewhere, hold slaves, and that there are many families who have no other servants but slaves that are bought from dealers visiting these northern districts once or twice every year.

If slaves are bought when wanted, as a matter of course they are sold when, by any cause, they are not wanted. Hence the case of a European citizen or protected native selling slaves, even privately, to a Moorish subject or otherwise, which necessarily occurs now and then, is the worst example that could be set by men professing civilization in this country, as it is nothing less than encouraging the nefarious trade in human beings.

Under these circumstances, surely there can be no hope of doing away with the horrors of slavery in the Moorish Empire.—*Al Moghreb Al-Aksa*, April 8th.

---

## TESTIMONIAL TO MR. CHARLES H. ALLEN.

ON his resignation of the Secretaryship of the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, which Mr. Allen had held for nearly 20 years, it was thought by some of his friends that a testimonial might be raised in appreciation of his long-continued work in the Anti-Slavery cause.

The appeal was liberally responded to, and amongst the contributors appear the names of H.M. THE KING OF THE BELGIANS, VISCOUNT CROMER, SIR GEORGE TAUBMAN GOLDIE, the BARONESS BURDETT-COUTTS, SIR T. FOWELL BUXTON, and many other well-known abolitionists. It is intended shortly to close the fund and present the amount raised to Mr. Allen. Cheques, &c., crossed *Lloyds Bank Limited*, may be forwarded to HENRY GURNEY, Esq., Nutwood, Reigate; to ARNOLD PYE SMITH, Esq., 32, Queen Victoria Street, E.C.; or they may be paid into Lloyds Bank, to credit of C. H. Allen Testimonial Fund.

---

## SLAVE TRAFFIC IN EAST AFRICA.

ZANZIBAR, May 5th.

The police, having obtained information that a Muscat dhow flying the French flag was about to sail with kidnapped slaves on board, informed the French Consul and requested that the boat might be searched by French officials in conjunction with representatives of the Government. The request was at once complied with, and the authorities discovered 20 slaves in the hold, who were immediately released and freed. The captain and crew were arrested and will be tried by the French Court. The new French Consul is doing his best to assist the Government.—*The Times*, May 6th.

## WRECK OF A SLAVE DHOW.

ZANZIBAR, *May 9th.*

An Arab dhow from Zanzibar, with 50 young slaves on board, has been wrecked off Wassein, an island off the coast, south of Mombasa. Thirty were drowned.—*Reuter.*

*The Times*, May 10th.

The above intelligence is not a little significant, and shows that the sea-borne traffic in slaves still goes on, in spite of our naval squadron and treaties not a few. The fact is that the more dangerous the trade is, the higher will be the prices realized by Arab traders. The news of this wreck, however, which seems to have taken place just off the British coast-strip, forms an ironical comment on the rose-coloured report of the successful suppression of the trade given by Sir Arthur Hardinge in the recent Blue Book "Africa No. 3 (1899)," from which we quote on another page.

## THE AFRICAN ASSOCIATION.

THE following circular has been sent to us by the Secretary, with a request for co-operation in the effort which the Association is making to render the proposed Conference next year a success. Among the Honorary Members are included such well-known names as those of Mr. H. R. Fox Bourne, Mr. Henry Gurney, Hon. Philip Stanhope, M.P., and Mr. George W. E. Russell :—

DEAR SIR,

In view of circumstances and a wide-spread ignorance which is prevalent in England about the treatment of Native Races under British Rule, the African Association, which consists of Members of the Race resident in England and which has been in existence now for nearly two years, has resolved during the Paris Exhibition in 1900 (which many representatives of the Race may be visiting) to hold a Conference in London in the month of May of the said year, in order to take steps to influence public opinion on existing proceedings and conditions affecting the welfare of the Natives in the various parts of the Empire, viz., SOUTH AFRICA, WEST AFRICA, and the B. WEST INDIES.

(Signed) H. MASON JOSEPH, *President.*

H. SYLVESTER WILLIAMS, *Hon. Sec.*

The Hon. Sec. will be pleased to hear from representative Natives who are desirous of attending.

Address :—Common Room, Gray's Inn, London, W.C.

## PORTRAIT OF PEMBA SLAVE-GIRL.

THE portrait which appeared in the last number of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (at p. 35) was taken from a photograph kindly lent to us, for the purpose of reproduction, by Mr. Francis W. Fox.